Church of Eng. - Orders

THE VALIDITY OF ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS

AND

ANGLICAN CLAIMS TO APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION

EXAMINED;

BY

PETER RICHARD KENRICK,

ARCHBISHOP OF ST. LOUIS.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND AUGMENTED.

IN WHICH ARE INSERTED REPLIES TO

"ESSAYS ON ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS,"
BY A LAYMAN;

AND

"ANGLICAN ORDINATIONS VALID,"

BY JOHN FULLER RUSSELL, B. C. L.

INCUMBENT OF S. JAMES'S ENFIELD.

1814-1884

"I have always taken this objection on the part of the Church of Rome, against the validity of our ordination, to have weight and difficulty in it."—THORNDIKE, JUST WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

PHILADELPHIA:
EUGENE CUMMISKEY, 130 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.
1848.

33272
262.17K
K41.2

Entered according to the Act of Congress, in the year 1848,

BY EUGENE CUMMISKEY,

In the Clerk's office of the District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

KING AND BAIRD, PRINTERS,
No. 9 George Street.

PREFACE.

The first edition of the present work has called forth two writers who have undertaken its refutation.* The "Essays on Anglican Ordination, by a Catholic Layman," embrace the whole of the controversy connected with this subject. The "Refutation" by Rev. John Fuller Russell, only professes to controvert some statements, in my former work, regarding the sentiments on Ordination entertained by the English Reformers, and the manner in which the denial of Anglican Orders was met by some of the first Anglican Bishops. The exceptions taken by these two writers to my arguments and statements, are examined in their proper places in the course of the following pages.

In the first edition, I urged as a mark of authenticity, the words "*Per breve de privato sigillo*," etc., which are found in some of the official documents connected with this controversy; and I rejected as unauthentic, or, at least, as of doubtful authenticity, the docu-

* *Essays to prove the validity of Anglican Ordinations; in answer to the Right Reverend Peter Richard Kenrick, R. C. Bishop of St. Louis. By a Layman.* Baltimore: Joseph Robinson, 1844. In the preface, the name of the writer is given—Hugh Davey Evans.

Anglican Ordinations valid. A Refutation of certain statements in the second and third Chapters of 'The validity of Anglican Ordinations examined, by the Very Reverend Peter Richard Kenrick, V. G.' By John Fuller Russell, B. C. L., Incumbent of St. James's Enfield. London: Masters, 1846.—Davey.

ments of the class referred to, which have not these words appended to them. Mr. Evans denies that this distinction should be made; and he adduces the authority of Sir Francis Palgrave, keeper of the Rolls, in support of his assertion. As a contested principle cannot be employed in argumentation, I have, consequently, forborne to urge the observation in the present edition, in which, while I have relied on no document that has not such a qualification connected with it, I have not, on this ground, rejected such as are brought forward by Anglican writers; although I have otherwise shown that they are of questionable character. I shall, however, observe, that as nothing can be more reasonable than to apply the rules of strict construction to official documents, nothing can be more certain than that among the documents connected with this controversy, there are several which cannot be so interpreted, without being found in contradiction with others equally entitled to our confidence. It is obvious, then, that if we have no clue to guide us in this labyrinth—nothing to distinguish between genuine and spurious documents, or if we cannot say that the language of such documents must be strictly interpreted, we can derive no aid whatsoever from them, in this or any other discussion, in which they may be employed.

Whoever compares the present edition with that which preceded it, will perceive that, while the positions of the former are maintained in this volume, the arguments before employed have been considerably developed, and, in some instances, modified. I have omitted the chapter in which I stated what were the principles which guided me in this examination; because these principles are the same in every discussion, where official documents are adduced as evidence,

or where facts, which have long been asserted and denied, are to be investigated. I have changed also the arrangement of the matters of which I had to treat; and have examined the questions of Parker's Lambeth consecration, Barlow's consecration, and the validity of King Edward's Ordinal, without any reference to the consecration said to have taken place at Cheapside. In a separate chapter, I have given a summary of the arguments advanced by those who affirm and by those who deny this occurrence.

The delay in the appearance of the present volume is to be ascribed to the circumstance, that its preparation required a reference to works which I have but rarely the opportunity of consulting; and consequently a longer absence from the scene of more important duties, than, up to the present time, I have been able to allow myself.

PHILADELPHIA, 23*d August*, 1848.

CONTENTS.

Page

CHAPTER I.—State of the Question, ... 9

CHAPTER II.—Sentiments of English Reformers regarding Ordination, . 20

CHAPTER III.—First Anglican bishops reproached by Catholic contemporary writers with not having received consecration, ... 36

Harding, ... 53

Stapleton, ... 59

Sanders, ... 63

Bristow, ... 64

Rainolds, Weston, Osorius, ... 66

Note on the controversy between Jewel and Harding, . . 76

CHAPTER IV.—Parker's Consecration, ... 95

§ 1. Royal commissions, ... 96

§ 2. The Lambeth Register, ... 109

Intrinsic evidences of fabrication 120

Facts inconsistent with the Register, . . . 126

Silence of contemporary writers, ... 127

§ III. Parker's book "De antiquitate Brittannicæ Ecclesiæ," and other writings, ... 134

CHAPTER V.—Barlow's Consecration, ... 147

CHAPTER VI.—Ordinal of King Edward VI., ... 176

The form of ordaining priests made by the Convocation after the restoration of King Charles II. in 1682, . 196

The form of consecrating bishops made in the same year, 197

CHAPTER VII.—Nag's Head Consecration, ... 207

CHAPTER VIII.—Mission, ... 234

APPENDIX I.—Courayer, ... 291

II.—Dr. Milner's Letter to Dr. Elrington, ... 293

III.—Extract from Burnet's exposition of the twenty-third article, . 307

IV.—An act concerning the consecration of a bishop, made the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII., ... 311

V.—Statutes relating to the consecration of bishops, under Edward, in 1547, 1549, and 1552, ... 313

Page

VI.—An act in the year 1549 to order the drawing up of a new form of ordination, ... 313

VII.—An act in 1552, to annex the Ordinal to the Book of Common Prayer, ... 313

VIII.—An acte for the repeele of certayne statutes made in the time of Edward, ... 314

IX.—An act to re-establish the Book of Common Prayer, . . 317

X.—Queen Elizabeth's Letters Patent, ... 318

XI.—Approbation of the preceding form, ... 319

XII.—Confirmation of Parker's election, ... 320

XIII.—Record of Parker's consecration, ... 322

XIV.—Extract from Roll in C. C. C. Cambridge, ... 326

XV.—Memorial presented to Clement XI., by John C. Gordon, . 326

XVI.—Forms of the Greek Church, ... 330

Greek Liturgy, ... 331

Syrian Nestorian Liturgy, ... 333

Ancient Western Liturgy, ... 334

Salzbury Pontifical, ... 336

MS. Roman Pontifical, ... 337

MS. Pontifical of Lyons, ... 338

Roman Pontifical, ... 339

Book of Common Prayer, ... 340

CHAPTER I.

STATE OF THE QUESTION.

In the following pages I propose to examine the question, whether the ordinations of the Church by law established in England be valid, and, consequently, whether we are to regard as validly ordained ministers of the Gospel those who have received orders in that Church, or who, like the ministers of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, derive their orders from it. This is a question of fact, resolvable into two other facts, first, whether Mathew Parker, the first bishop of the Church of England, received consecration from a bishop who himself had been duly consecrated; and second, whether the form of such consecration was a valid form. The first of these two facts is to be established or impugned like any other event, purely by historic evidence; and although the second requires a reference to a doctrinal discussion, I shall endeavour, in treating of it, to keep within the bounds of what can be maintained by testimony.

It may not be unnecessary to state what relation the proposed investigation has to the religious controversies of the day; and, at the same time, to give a sketch of the facts connected with the history of this controversy.

Whether the Anglican orders be valid or not, does not involve any dogma or principle of Catholic faith. The Church recognizes the orders of the Greek and other schismatic churches, which are separated from her communion; nor would she hesitate to admit those of the Anglican Church, were their validity sustained by the facts of the case. It would, therefore, be an error to suppose that Catholic principles oblige us to deny the validity of the Anglican ordinations, except, as far as their invalidity has been recognized by the Church. It has been even regarded by some as a great

misfortune, that the succession of the ministry was not kept up in England, at the time of the change of religion in that country. Speaking of the attempt made by a French ecclesiastic, Courayer, to defend the ordinations of the English Church, Chardon says;— "It would have been desirable that he (Courayer) had cleared up all doubt on this subject, since there would then be one obstacle less to a reunion, of which we should never despair; and this would attach still more closely to the Catholic Church, that illustrious nation, from which so many learned and holy men have sprung, and which, even now, is so famous for the number of virtuous and scientific men whom it produces, and who are distinguished from all other Calvinists, by their regard for the Episcopal hierarchy, the rights and prerogatives of which they zealously maintain."* It is not, then, from any principle she holds, or any apparent advantage the denial might be supposed to afford her, that the Catholic Church rejects the ordinations of the Anglican Church; but because the facts of the case do not warrant her in coming to any other conclusion.

It is here necessary to point out the distinction between a *valid* and a *lawful* ordination. The one is an act, to which nothing is wanting that is necessary to give it effect; whereas, the other is one, not only complete in itself, but conformable to the laws that have been made to direct and govern the power that produced it. If a clergyman who has been suspended from the exercise of the ministry, continues to perform official acts, these would, in most instances, be *valid.* They would not, indeed, be *lawful* acts, but, on the contrary, a sacrilegious abuse of the powers of the ministry. Were a Catholic bishop to apostatize from the faith, and confer orders on his partizans in error, his apostacy or heresy, would not invalidate the act, although it would render it *unlawful.* And hence the Catholic Church regards all ordinations that are made in the sects separated from her communion, as *unlawful;* but she considers only those *invalid,* in which either the ordaining prelate was not himself consecrated, or in which he employed a defective form, or in which he had no intention of performing a sacred rite.

The claims to an apostolical succession for the reformed English Church, which have been so confidently put forth, especially in

* Chardon, Histoire des Sacremens. De L'Ordre. Liv. I. c. 8.

modern times, do not reach back to the period of its origin. It was not till an advanced period in the reign of Elizabeth that the Anglican episcopacy claimed to have a superiority, of divine right, over the second order of the clergy.

On the 12th of January, 1588, a sermon was preached at St. Paul's Cross, London, by Dr. Bancroft, then chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, whom he succeeded in the archiepiscopal chair, after occupying for a time the see of London. "In it," says Hetherington, a Presbyterian writer, "he maintained that bishops were a distinct order from priests or presbyters, and had authority over them *jure divino*, and directly from God. This bold assertion created an immense ferment throughout the kingdom. The Puritans saw well, that if acted upon, this principle would increase their oppression to an incalculable degree, inasmuch as it must subject them to an accusation of heresy, in addition to that of resistance to the queen's supremacy. The greater part even of the prelatic party were startled with the novelty of the doctrine, for none of the English Reformers had ever regarded the order of bishops as any thing else but a human institution, appointed for the more orderly government of the Church, and they were not prepared at once to condemn as heretical all churches wherein that institution did not exist. Whitgift himself, perceiving the use which might be made of such a tenet, said that the Doctor's sermon had done much good—though, for his own part, he rather wished than believed it to be true. On the other hand, the legal assertors of the queen's supremacy assailed this theory, as subversive of her majesty's prerogative; for, as they reasoned, if the bishops are not under governors to her majesty, of the clergy, but superior governors over their brethren, by God's ordinance, it will then follow that her majesty is not supreme governor over her clergy. Bancroft answered, that this inference was not a necessary consequence of his doctrine, because the sovereign's authority may, and very often does, corroborate that which is primarily from the law of God. This evasive reply seems to have satisfied the queen, aided perhaps by her own knowledge of its direct purpose, and of the character of her bishops who longed for the extirpation of puritanism, but had no desire to encounter her leonine wrath."*

* History of the Westminster Assembly, p. 50, New York.

It is very frequently said, that the change of religion in England under Elizabeth, was the act of the church of that country, reforming itself. Were this theory sustained by fact—the question would still remain, whether the Church of England could, after such change, claim for herself any of the privileges she possessed before it occurred.

But if the change was the work, not of the Church, but of the State,—if the power of the crown was the principal influence exerted on the occasion, and the will of the temporal sovereign the rule on which the new system was constructed,—it is needless to say, that not even the possession of the same ministerial character by such ecclesiastics as lent themselves to the occasion, could identify them with those whose places they may have held in the material temple, but to whom they cannot be considered as successors in any other than a material order.

That this was the real character of the change in religion under Elizabeth is easily shown. It was effected against the will of the whole episcopal body; all the members of which, with the exception of a feeble old man, called by the protestant Camden, "the calamity of his see," preferred to be deprived of their sees, rather than acquiesce in the queen's measures. Even this weak prelate* did only as much as was required to escape deprivation, by taking the oath of supremacy, but remained in other respects Catholic. Both orders of clergy, assembled in convocation in 1559, the very year the change took place, presented to parliament the following declaration of their principles on those points which were then generally denied by innovators.

"1. That in the sacrament of the altar, by virtue of Christ's assisting, after the word is duly pronounced by the priest, the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, is really present under the species of bread and wine, as also his natural blood.

"2. That after the consecration there remains not the substance of bread and wine, nor any substance, save the substance of God and man.

* "For one alone, I must confess, was made to break unity, of whom a right good Catholic bishop said to a nobleman, we had but one fool among us, and him you have gotten unto you, little worthy of the name of bishop and lord, whose learning was small, and honour thereby much stained."—*Harding, Confutation*, p. 6, c. 2.

"3. That the true body of Christ and his blood is offered for a propitiatory sacrifice, for the quick and the dead.

"4. That the supreme power of feeding and governing the militant church of Christ, and of confirming their brethren, is given to Peter the apostle, and to his lawful successors in the see apostolic, as unto the Vicars of Christ.

"5. That the authority to handle and define such things which belong to faith, the sacraments, and the discipline ecclesiastical, both hitherto ever belonged, and only ought to belong to the pastors of the Church, whom the Holy Spirit hath placed in the Church, and not unto laymen."*

This authentic declaration of the doctrine of the English Church by her recognized organ, the Convocation, on the eve of the innovations which Elizabeth had determined to make, and which she ultimately effected, shows, that the change was the act of the State, not the free choice of the Church. When the bishops were deprived, for their disregard of the royal wishes, and when the terrors of destitution, exile, or imprisonment were employed to force the clergy to measures which they abhorred,† some weak and unworthy men were found to bend beneath the storm, they had not courage to brave. Some soothed their consciences with the hope that the proposed change, like those which had preceded it, would not be permanent; others were unwilling to exchange

* Heylin, p. 115.—"The profession of faith made by the Convocation of 1559, was presented to the House of Lords on the 1st of March. On the 10th of the same month the Bishop of London informed them, that a copy had been sent to the Universities, and that all the articles except the last, had been signed by these bodies."—*Wilkins*, iv. 179, 180, *apud Tierney*, i. 133. The last article, 5, had reference to the power of the crown in matters of religion.

† Referring to the first stage of the English Reformation, a modern writer says: "The main body of the clergy was certainly very reluctant to tear themselves, at the pleasure of a disappointed monarch, in the most dangerous crisis of religion, from the bosom of Catholic unity. (Strype, 1, 151.) They complied, indeed, with all the measures of government far more than men of rigid consciences could have endured to do; but many who wanted the courage of More and Fisher, were not far removed from their way of thinking.—It was no longer possible for the prelacy to offer an efficacious opposition to the Reformation they abhorred." Hallam, Const. Hist. ii. pp. 50, 54. Paris edition. "The use of the old religion," says Paget, in remonstrating with Somerset (under Edward VI.) on his rough treatment of some of the gentry, and partiality to the commons, "is forbidden by law, and the use of the new is not yet printed in the stomachs of eleven out of twelve parts of the realm, whatever countenance men make outwardly to please them in whom they see the power resteth." Strype 2, Ap. apud Hallam, who, referring to the German troops brought over to coerce the English, says, "This is somewhat an humiliating admission, that the protestant faith was imposed on our ancestors by a foreign army." Const. Hist. ii. p. 69.

poverty and obscurity for opulence and station; and not a few were indifferent to religion, in consequence of the many changes in the preceding reigns.

The Catholic historian, Dodd, says;—"It is not to be doubted, but that the reformation set on foot by Queen Elizabeth, was contrary to the inclinations of all the governing part of the clergy, or, at least, of a great majority; and that they protested against it. The bishops were all deprived and imprisoned on that account. The convocation met, as the reader has seen, and subscribed to a profession of faith, directly contrary to the reformed doctrine. Great numbers of the most eminent clergy went abroad; and there was scarce any university, either in Flanders, France, or Italy, but one or more might be found in them, besides others that were entertained as professors of divinity in foreign monasteries. A great many, indeed, still remained in England, and conformed for a while, in hopes that the Queen would relent, and things come about again. But their hopes vanishing, they forsook their benefices and followed their countrymen over the seas. There was not a province through all England where several of Queen Mary's clergy did not reside, and were commonly called the old priests. They served as chaplains in private families. Their names and places of residence I have frequently met with in the manuscripts I perused in composing this work. Again, several Catholic clergymen found such friends as to be permitted to enjoy sinecures, without being disturbed by oaths and other injunctions.

"This noncompliance of so many of the clergy left the reformers unprovided with teachers, and persons proper for that function: in so much that Collier says, 'that upon the Catholic clergy throwing up their preferment the necessities of the church required the admitting of some mechanics into orders.'* The strength of the party that opposed the reformation appears still more from the account which the protestant writers give of the desertion that happened in our universities, and scarcity of persons sufficiently qualified to instruct the people. 'It must be known,' saith Anthony Wood, 'that in the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the University of Oxford was so empty, after the Catholics had left it upon the alteration of religion, that there was very seldom a sermon preached in the University Church, called St. Mary."

* Collier, ii. 465.

And in another place he adds, 'there was not one then (1564,) in that society, (of Merton College,) that could or would preach any public sermon in the college turn: such was the scarcity of theologists, not only in that house, but generally throughout the University.'* The same Oxford historian also gives us several particulars of this grand defection. He names twenty-two persons of note, ejected out of the New College only, seven out of St. John's College; and great numbers out of the colleges of St. Mary Magdalen, Lincoln and Trinity; so that the University seemed to be entirely destroyed. He tells us, moreover, that the persons left were few, and so entirely illiterate, that an order came out for every one to con over the Bible, and lessons, being unable to read them distinctly otherwise: that a like order came out for liberty to make use of the common prayer in the Latin tongue, there being some danger of losing that language in the University; and that Thomas Sampson and Dr. Humphrey, and perhaps a third, named Andrew Kingsmill, were the only persons who could preach with any reputation. Now these preachers being all puritans, they filled the University with Calvinistical notions.'† This desolate condition of Oxford is, in like manner, taken notice of by Jewel, Parker, and others. 'Our Universities,' saith Jewel, 'are in a most lamentable condition:—there are not above two in Oxford of our sentiments.'‡ Archbishop Parker tells the Queen, there were not two men able or willing to read the Lady Margaret's lecture; and though they had a great many preachers, yet he was afraid several of them were but slenderly furnished for that employment.'§ It appears from these accounts that whatever these might be as to the number of the whole, most of the clergy of character, upon account either of morals or of learning, stood firm in the belief of the old religion."‖

The men who were intruded by the State into the vacancies occasioned by the expulsion of the Catholic clergy, were not of a character to give much weight to the cause they embraced. Had we not the avowals of Protestant writers to sustain our statement, we should not venture to describe them in our own language.

In the conclusion of his history, Heylin inserts an address to Bishop Jewel, by one John Rastel, a fugitive priest, in which,

* Wood. Athen. Oxon. i. 161, 429.
† Antiq. Oxon. 283, 284, 285.
‡ Apud Collier, ii. 432.
§ Collier, ii. 527.
‖ Dodd, ii. 141, 143.

says he, "I conceive that he hath faithfully delivered too many sad truths in these particulars." Among these "sad truths," is the following description of the sort of people who were intruded into the places of the Catholic clergy in England. "Whereas the Church of God so well ordered with excellent men of learning and godlinesse, is constrained to suffer coblers, weavers, tinkers, tanners, card-makers, tapsters, fidlers, gaolers, and others of like profession, not only to enter into disputing with her, but also to climb up into pulpits, and to keep the place of priests, and ministers, &c." "Or that any bag-pipers, horse-coursers, jaylers, ale-tasters were admitted then into the clergy without good and long trial of their conversation."* Anthony Fuller bears the following testimony to the degradation of the clerical character at that time: "As for the inferior clergy under them," (the bishops) "the best that could be gotten were placed in pastoral charges. Alas! tolerability was eminency in that age. A rush candle seemed a torch, where no brighter light was ne'er seen before. Surely preaching now ran very low, if it be what I read that Mr. Tavanour, of Water Eaton, in Oxfordshire, High Sheriff of the county, came in pure charity, not ostentation, and gave the scholars a sermon at St. Maries, with his gold chain about his neck, and his sword by his side, beginning with the words:

'Arriving at the mount of St. Maries on the stony stage (pulpit,) where I now stand, I have brought you some fine biskets, baked in the oven of charity, and carefully conserved for the chickens of the church, the sparrows of the spirit, and the sweet swallows of salvation.'"†

In organizing the new church, a serious difficulty presented itself. The queen desired an ecclesiastical hierarchy, which should resemble, as far as possible, that which had been supplanted, to which the people had been accustomed, and which, it was feared, could not be dispensed with, without exposing the State to considerable peril, and probably rendering the experiment of a change in the nation's faith more hazardous than ought, in prudence, to be attempted.

Mathew Parker was chosen by the queen to be the first Protestant archbishop of Canterbury. It is not pretended that he was consecrated by any of the Catholic bishops. According to the

* P. 162, Heylin, 174—175. † Book IX.

advocates of Anglican orders, he received episcopal consecration on the 17th of December, 1559, in the chapel of Lambeth, at the hands of William Barlow, assisted by John Scory, Miles Coverdale, and John Hodgkins, all of whom are said, by Anglican writers, to have been bishops duly consecrated. Barlow, the consecrating prelate, is said to have been made bishop by Henry VIII., and, on occasion of Parker's consecration, to have used the form of ordination known as King Edward VI.'s, in whose reign it had been introduced.

With regard to this important fact, there are three questions, each of which is matter of controversy, and, yet, all of which must be satisfactorily answered in the affirmative, before those who trace their orders to Mathew Parker, can conclude that they are validly ordained. First. Was Parker really consecrated by Barlow, in the manner described? Second. Was Barlow himself consecrated? Third. Was King Edward's form a valid form?

If these questions can be affirmatively answered, then the ordinations of the English Church are valid; its bishops have the same episcopal character as the Catholic bishops; its ministers are priests, equally as those who minister at Catholic altars; in a word, the ecclesiastical hierarchy has been preserved in the English Church, although, being separated from the communion of the Catholic Church, they are withered branches, through which the vivifying sap of apostolical jurisdiction does not circulate.

But if one of the above three facts be disproved, or if any one of them be not certain, although somewhat probable; if positive and unsuspicious testimony be not at hand whereby *all three* can be established, then the validity of the Anglican ordinations is either positively disproved, or, at least, uncertain.

A participation of the apostolic ministry, by means of valid ordination, does not, however, suffice for the lawful exercise of its functions: and to infer that the Anglican Church enjoys an apostolical succession because she has an apostolic ministry, would be to overlook one of the most obvious, and most universally admitted principles of church government. When a clergyman is silenced by his bishop, no orthodox Churchman attaches any importance to his ministrations, because he has ceased to derive the *right* of ministering, from the source in which ecclesiastical authority is presumed to dwell. Suppose that there is question not of an individual, but of a body of clergymen,—of a

bishop, or of many bishops, who rebel against the Church of which they were ordained ministers, and are, therefore, deprived by the proper authority of the *right* to continue to act as ministers of such church; surely there is no difference in principle between this case and that of an individual clergyman, silenced for errors or misconduct. Whatever ministerial acts such a body of men perform, are *unlawful*, and in opposition to the authority from which they originally derived the right to minister. Every unprejudiced observer will perceive that where there is no identity of religious principle, no uniformity of faith, there cannot be any thing like succession, which supposes a moral identity not only in character, but principle, as also the continued transmission of the same sacred deposit of doctrine from each pastor to his successor, and not the mere fact that one bishop succeeds another in the same see, without any regard to the doctrines professed by each. To illustrate this position by the case in question: it is not denied that Cardinal Pole was followed in the see of Canterbury by Mathew Parker; but it is equally undeniable that Pole would have considered Parker a heretic, and that Parker regarded Pole as an idolater. To suppose, then, that they were both links of the same chain—both equally capable of transmitting the apostolical succession,—is to confound all notions, and contradict the most universally received maxims. As well might Cromwell be considered one of the Stuart kings of England, or Napoleon Bonaparte one of the Bourbon race, as Mathew Parker—even if validly ordained—be regarded as a link added to the chain of Catholic archbishops of Canterbury, reaching down from St. Augustine to Cardinal Pole, in whom that illustrious series of pontiffs ceased.

Before concluding this chapter, I shall add a few words regarding the history of this controversy, which is coëval with the existence of the Anglican Church, and will, in all likelihood, continue until that church be re-united with the See of Rome, or, being cast away by the civil power, from which she first derived existence, shall be torn to pieces by the progress of dissent among her own children. The validity of the ordinations of the new church was warmly contested during the whole reign of Elizabeth; and of all the points then controverted between the Catholics and Anglicans, there is, perhaps, none which the former more repeatedly urged, than the defect of orders in their opponents. In the early part of the reign of James I., the controversy was renewed, or, to speak

more correctly, continued. The reference to the register of Parker's consecration, found in the archives of Lambeth, then, for the first time made, may be said to form an epoch in the history of the controversy. The authenticity of this register was denied by the Catholic writers, and as warmly maintained by their opponents. In Chapter IV. of this work, the reader will find the principal arguments in support of each opinion. In the early part of the last century, the validity of Anglican orders was warmly advocated in France by Courayer, who was answered by several divines, among others by Hardouin and Le Quien, and whose works on the subject were censured by several French prelates.* In England, Mr. Thomas Ward, a learned convert from Protestantism, in his "Cantos on the English Reformation," his "Errata of the Protestant Bible," and "The Controversy of Ordination truly stated," directed public attention to this subject, and gave occasion to a very ample development of the curious facts connected with it. The republication of Ward's "Controversy of Ordination truly stated," in Dublin, 1807, drew forth from Dr. Elrington, of Trinity College, in that city, a reply, of which the reader will find a notice in the letter of Right Rev. Dr. Milner, found in the Appendix to this work.† The name of Dr. Lingard has been introduced into this controversy, in consequence of a note to his History of England, in which he affirms the fact of Parker's consecration at Lambeth; but in his letter published in defence of this opinion, he has disclaimed any intention to pronounce thereby on the *validity* of the act. A remarkable circumstance connected with this controversy, is, that the most successful defender of the Anglican ordinations, the very Achilles of the numerous bands that have been marshalled on this side of the discussion, —was a Catholic priest, Courayer, Canon regular of St. Généviéve, Paris. In the Appendix will be found a sketch of this man's character, from which it will be evident that the Anglicans have

* See Appendix I. Rev. Mr. Husenbeth, in his valuable work, "Faberism exposed and refuted," asks his Rev. antagonist, who had triumphantly referred to Courayer, for a solution of all difficulties on this subject:—"Has he" (Mr. Faber) "never heard of the Journalists of Trevoux,—of Le Quien,—of Hardouin,—of St. Réné,—of Cleophilus Alethes (*alias* Constable),—of Fennel,—who all refuted Courayer? Is he ignorant of the works of Sanders, Harding, Stapleton, Reynolds, Bristow, Allen, Kellison, Worthington, Champney, Talbot, Ward, Hatton, Dodd, Challoner, Milner, and Fletcher, who have all written powerfully against the validity of the Anglican orders?" p. 527.

† Appendix II.

little cause to glory in him as a partizan ;* and in the course of the following investigation, it will be shown, that notwithstanding the talent and learning with which he advocated their claims, he has failed establishing them.

CHAPTER II.

SENTIMENTS OF THE ENGLISH REFORMERS REGARDING ORDINATION.

An inquiry into the sentiments concerning the necessity of ordination, entertained and professed by the first bishops of the Anglican Church, will not be without its utility in the examination of the facts which form the subject of the present investigation. If it appears that they recognized the distinction between the priestly and the episcopal order, and acknowledged the necessity of receiving episcopal consecration, we shall reluctantly believe that they neglected to receive it: but if it can be shown that they regarded it either as a useless or superstitious rite; that they recognized in the Temporal Ruler, the power of conferring, not only the jurisdiction, but also the character of a bishop; and that they ridiculed the importance attached by Catholics to this solemn seal of the ministerial character, we shall not be astonished to find their acts in unison with their principles.

The parent of the unhappy schism of the sixteenth century, Martin Luther, taught, that the ministers of religion differed from the laity only in their election to the office of teacher. In his theory, every christian is a priest. "Let every christian," says he, "therefore, acknowledge that we are all equally priests; that is, that we have the same power in the word, and in every sacrament; but that it is not lawful for each one to use that power, unless elected by the community or called by the ruler."†

* Appendix I.

† Agnoscat itaque quicunque se christianum esse cognoverit, omnes nos aequaliter esse sacerdotes, hoc est, eamdem in verbo et quocunque sacramento habere potestatem: verum non licere quemquam hac ipsa uti, nisi consensu communitatis, aut vocatione majoris." Lib. de cap. Bab. t. II. fol. 298.

Every christian is thus supposed to be invested by baptism with equal powers "in the word and in every sacrament;" and *election* is alone required, to prevent the confusion which would arise from each individual exercising the powers he possesses. It is not necessary to refer to the sentiments of the other continental reformers on this subject; it being notorious that they denied the necessity of episcopal ordination. I have noticed those of Luther, because the great patriarch of Anglicanism, Archbishop Cranmer, is known to have imbibed his principles.

To confine myself, then, to the English reformers, the sentiments of Cranmer on this subject may be learned from a document in the Appendix to Burnet's History of the Reformation, entitled, "The resolution of several Bishops and Divines of some questions concerning the Sacraments." The ninth question, is, "Whether the apostles, lacking a higher power, as in not having a Christian king among them, made bishops by that necessity, or by authority given them by God?" In reply to this, the Archbishop of Canterbury, (Cranmer,) said, "All Christian princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole cure of all their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word for the cure of souls, as concerning the administration of things political and of civil governance." In answer to the tenth question, "Whether bishops were before priests, or priests before bishops; and if so, did not the priests make the bishops?" he replied, "that the bishops and priests were at one time, and were no two things, but both one office in the beginning of Christ's religion." To the eleventh question, he answered, "a bishop may make a priest by the Scripture, and so may princes and governors also; and by the authority of God." He says, that laymen may make priests by election. In answer to the twelfth question, he replies: "In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a bishop or priest, needeth no consecration by the Scripture; for election or appointing thereto is sufficient."*

Referring to these answers of the archbishop, the author of the abridgment of Burnet's History, says:—

"Cranmer had at this time some particular opinions concerning ecclesiastical offices; that they were delivered from the king, as

* Burnet's History of the Reformation, App. Records, No. 21, pp. 220–228. London, 1679.

other civil offices were, and that ordination was not indispensably necessary, and was only a ceremony, that might be used or laid aside; but that the authority was delivered to churchmen only by the king's commission."*

Mr. Russell charges me with unfairness, in referring to the abridgment of Burnet, when I could have referred to the original text, from which I had immediately before made a quotation; especially as Burnet indicates a probable change of opinion on this subject in Cranmer. Whether the change of opinion in Cranmer, if it really took place, justifies the charge of unfairness, the reader must determine. I am not charged with mis-stating Cranmer's answers, nor with misquoting the abridgment of Burnet. A writer, certainly, is at liberty to exercise his judgment as well in selecting his authorities as in estimating the force of arguments. The proof of a change in Cranmer's sentiments on the subject of ordination, is to my mind inconclusive. Mr. Russell adduces, as evidence of Cranmer's return to better principles: I. The Convocation of 1543, affirmed that "Order is a gift or grace of ministration in CHRIST's Church, given of God to Christian men by the consecration and imposition of the bishop's hands upon them. And as the apostles themselves, in the beginning of the Church, did order priests and bishops, so they appointed and willed the other bishops after them to do the like." The book in which this declaration is contained, was, says Mr. Russell, revised by Cranmer, and referred to the Convocation shortly after his "Answers to the Questions on the Sacraments," were written. II. "In 1548, Cranmer 'set forth by authority' the following statement. 'The ministration of God's word, (which our Lord Jesus Christ himself did first institute,) was derived from the apostles unto others after them, by imposition of hands and giving of the Holy Ghost, from the apostles' times to our days. And this was the consecration, orders and unction of the apostles, whereby they, at the beginning, made bishops and priests, and this shall continue in the Church, even to the world's end.' "†

How far the declaration of the Convocation may be supposed to express the individual sentiments of Cranmer, cannot now be known; as such declaration was in accordance with the sentiments of the majority of the members composing that body.

* Burnet's Abridgment, lib. i. p. 250.

† Refutation, 19, 20.

At the beginning of Edward's reign, when the declaration referred to in the second place was put forth, the Reformation was sought to be made as little startling as possible.* This catechism, so strongly relied on by Mr. Russell as a proof of Cranmer's orthodoxy on the subject of ordination, was one of the means adopted for the purpose of promoting the Reformation, without exciting attention, and is a remarkable monument of the archbishop's insincerity. Mr. Tierney thus describes it. "It was a translation made and published by the archbishop from the Dutch. There are some points in this treatise, that are worthy of notice. With the Catholic Church, Cranmer comprises the two prohibitions of false gods and images in one commandment. He speaks of penance as a sacrament, inculcates the duty of frequent confession, expresses a wish for the revival of the ancient penitential canons, and, contrary to the principles avowed by him in the late reign, distinctly asserts the divine origin of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction."†

Cranmer was a Lutheran in principle ever since his visit to Germany, before his elevation to the archiepiscopal chair. The insincerity of his character, his shifting sail to every wind of heterodoxy, his perfidious hypocrisy in co-operating in the death of those who held the doctrines which he himself entertained, and which, after some half dozen proffered recantations, he died in professing—these were, and are my motives for recognizing in his "Answers" the genuine expression of his sentiments, and for disregarding the efforts of panegyrists or apologists to make them pass as temporary errors.‡

* Dodd, vol. ii. p. 29. † Ibidem, 28, *note.*

‡ The insincerity and inconsistency of Cranmer were objected to him by Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, at the beginning of Edward's reign. In a letter to the archbishop, Gardiner says:—"And, therefore, after your grace hath for years lived in the agreement of that doctrine, under our late sovereign lord, now, so suddenly after his death, to write to me that his highness was '*seduced*,' it is, I assure you, a very strange speech."—*Gardiner to Cranmer. Strype's Cranmer, App.* 74.

Feckenham, the Abbot of Westminster, in his place in parliament, in 1559, thus speaks of Cranmer. "How contrary was he, (Cranmer,) to himself in this matter! When in one year, he did set forth a catechism in the English tongue, and did dedicate the same unto King Edward VI., wherein he did most confidently affirm and defend the real presence of Christ's body in the Holy Eucharist, and very shortly after, he did set forth another book, wherein he did most shamefully deny the same, falsifying both the Scriptures and the doctors, to the no small admiration of all learned readers." "And in the last book that Dr. Cranmer and his accomplices did set forth of the communion, in King Edward VI.'s days, these plain words of Christ, Hoc est corpus meum, did so incumber them and trouble their

On this point, Courayer is forced to abandon all attempt at vindicating Cranmer. He says: "It evidently appears that Cranmer and Barlow, two of the prelates appointed to reform the public liturgy and form of ordination, were notoriously erroneous in the matter of orders. To be convinced of this, we need go no farther than examine the questions concerning the sacraments, which were proposed to several prelates and some divines, whose opinions were required. In their answer to several questions proposed, relating to the number of the sacraments, ordination is always excluded, excepting in their answer to the fourth question, where they extend the word 'sacrament' to many things which are only figures or plainly ceremonies. In the answer to the seventh question, Cranmer and Barlow exclude ordination particularly from the number of the sacraments, as carrying no virtual efficacy with it. In a word, pure presbyterianism without disguise discovers itself in all the answers; and it is but too apparent, that the chief aim of these divines and prelates was to extinguish episcopacy."*

Referring to these words of Courayer, Mr. Russell says, "The assertions attributed to Courayer and quoted by Dr. Kenrick, that 'pure presbyterianism without disguise discovers itself in all the answers, and it is but too apparent that the chief aim of the divines and prelates was to extinguish episcopacy'—if designed to refer *generally* to the 'several prelates and divines whose opinions were required,' and their replies, are notoriously *false*." In the note on this place, he adds: "Courayer himself denies, and contradicts at some length, the above statements. In fact they were made by him for the purpose of *refutation*. See his 'Defence,' p. 147–153, and the foregoing note. Dr. Kenrick quotes them as if Courayer owned their veracity. Is this honest?"—*Refutation*, p. 10.

I answer, first, that the assertions are not only attributed to Courayer, but found in his work, and that he does not adduce them for the purpose of their refutation, as Mr. Russell states,

wits, that they did leave out in the same last book, the verb substantive *est*, and made the sense of Christ's words to be there englished, *Take eat this my body*, and left out there, *this is my body*, which thing being copied by others, and great fault found withal, when they were fain to patch up the matter, with a little piece of paper clapped over the aforesaid words, wherein was written the verb substantive *est*."—*Abbot Feckenham's Speech in the House of Lords, against the Liturgy, in* 1559. Tierney's Dodd, ii. App. cclvi.

* Page 147.

although he endeavours to refute the consequence drawn from them. Is it honest in Mr. Russell to state the contrary?—Secondly, there is nothing in my statement, nor in that of Courayer, attributing these principles to any other than Cranmer and Barlow. Is it honest in Mr. Russell to ground a charge of contingent falsehood, on a supposition which has no foundation in my words? Courayer endeavours, as stated by me, to show that these errors of Cranmer and Barlow had no influence in the change of form under Edward VI., but does not and could not, without absurdity, attempt to refute his own words.

Courayer cites Burnet, to show that probably, Cranmer changed his opinion. On this Le Quien says: "The passage of Burnet which he alleges is precisely that employed by Bossuet, in his Variations, to show that Cranmer, Burnet's hero, was a cheat; who, at the time of Henry VIII., signed, along with the Catholic bishops, the contrary of what he believed. These subscriptions in the assemblies of the clergy, which were held at the commencement of the schism, in the years 1535 and 1537, are the proof of his bad faith, and have made Bossuet say, that this archbishop sanctioned every thing against his conscience; that the will of his master was his supreme rule; and that he carried his policy, and accommodating spirit into the most sacred recesses of religion."*

Again, Courayer says; "In 1536, among many errors which he (Barlow) was accused of spreading, he was charged with having maintained this proposition, 'That if the King's Grace, being Supreme Head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate and elect any layman (being learned,) to be a bishop, that he so chosen (without mention made of any orders) should be as good a bishop, as he is, or the best in England.'† The most obstinate Presbyterian never carried the no-necessity of ordination further."‡

Nor was this royal supremacy, which, as is stated by the writer

* Le Quien, t. 1, p. 85. † Collier, Hist. vol. ii. p. 135.

‡ Courayer, p. 148. Mr. Evans charges me with inconsistency, to which Mr. Russell, with that discourtesy which characterizes his *Refutation*, adds, by way of alternative, the charge of dishonesty, because I attribute these sentiments to Barlow, whom I subsequently deny to have been Bishop of St. David's; whereas, the word *Menevensis* "*of St. David's*," is given in the record whence the answers are taken. I reply, 1. I quote Courayer who attributes them to Barlow. 2. I did not deny that Barlow was Bishop of St. David's, but stated the motives which, some have thought, render it questionable. 3. I never quoted these answers, or the charge against Barlow, to prove that he was not Bishop of St. David's, as Mr. Russell affirms, however, I may have made use of them to sustain the position, that, whether Bishop of St. David's or not, there is reason to doubt that he was consecrated.

of Burnet's abridgment, the clergy placed "in some extraordinary grace conferred on the King in his coronation,"* suffered to lie dormant. Cranmer gave a practical proof of his principles, by throwing up his commission, and consenting to receive jurisdiction from the lustful and sanguinary tyrant, Henry VIII., in which, with the exception of Fisher of Rochester, he was imitated by all his fellow bishops.†

In the address to Henry on this occasion, the bishops state, "that all jurisdiction, civil and ecclesiastical, flowed from the King, and that they exercised it only at the King's courtesy; and as they had it of his bounty, so they would be ready to deliver it up, when he should be pleased to call for it." Accordingly, the King did empower them IN HIS STEAD, to give institution, and to do all the other parts of the episcopal function, which was to last during his pleasure: so that, as Burnet's abridger remarks, they were the King's bishops.‡

Referring to an act of Parliament passed in 1536, Mr. Lewis says: "The supreme secular power of the realm denies the divine authority of the prelates, and pronounces them to be such by virtue of its own authority, and of none other. So far as the State, the King, and the Parliament, in short the English nation, are concerned, the ecclesiastical body has no spiritual authority whatever; but is only the ministry which the secular power uses for teaching such religious doctrines, duties and observances as the State from time to time shall choose."§

* Lib. 2, p. 56.

† In the former edition, this fact was thus stated: "In common with all the other time-serving Bishops of that reign, with, however, the glorious exception of Fisher of Rochester, who suffered death, rather than acknowledge the royal supremacy,—Cranmer gave a practical proof of his principles, by throwing up his commission, and consenting to receive jurisdiction from the lustful and sanguinary tyrant, Henry VIII." The only thing which in the above sentence, I intended to say was common to Cranmer and his fellow bishops, was the giving up of their commissions. Mr. Russell has profited by the ambiguity, arising from, perhaps, an awkward collocation of words, but which has nothing else to sustain it, and repeatedly represents me as attributing to the "time-serving fellow bishops" of Cranmer, the principles avowed by this latter in his famous "answers." He accordingly fills two or three pages with extracts from the "answers," to show that these prelates held other and most unexceptionable principles; and triumphs at this palpable confutation of my supposed charge. So easy is it to refute an adversary by misrepresenting him.

Cranmer, at his trial, said, "He received a certain bull of the Pope, which he delivered unto the King, and was Archbishop by him." Foxe, 1704.

‡ P. 228.

§ Notes on the nature and extent of the Royal Supremacy in the Anglican Church, by David Lewis, M. A. London, 1847.

Thomas Cromwell, a layman, whom the King had made his Vicar General, took his seat in the Convocation of the clergy, as head over them.* At his coming into the house of Convocation, all the bishops paid him honour, and he sat in the highest place: he sent forth *injunctions* to all bishops and curates throughout the realm, charging them to do various duties of their calling.†

On the accession of Edward VI., Cranmer took out a new commission to exercise his episcopal functions, thereby to express more clearly his favourite principle, that all authority, ecclesiastical and civil, flowed from the throne.‡ Every thing was done to confirm this error. The bishops were made by the king's letters patent, and not, as before, by the election of the chapters: all processes and writings were made in the king's name only, with the bishop's attestation appended to it, and they were sealed with no other than the king's seal. "The intent of the contrivers of this act," says Dr. Heylin, "was by degrees to weaken the episcopal order, by forcing them from their strong hold of divine institution, and making them no other than the king's ministers only, his ecclesiastical sheriffs, to execute his will and dispense his mandates." Such was the practical effect of these measures, that the bishops were rendered incapable of conferring orders, unless previously empowered by a special license, the tenor whereof was in these words: "The king to such a bishop, greeting: Whereas all and all manner of jurisdiction, as well ecclesiastical as civil, flows from the king, as from the supreme head of all the body, &c., we therefore give and grant to thee full power and license to continue during our good pleasure, for holding ordination within thy diocese of N., and for promoting fit persons into holy orders, even to that of the priesthood."§

* Baker, p. 203. † Stow, p. 574.

‡ "It was the opinion of Cranmer, that his archiepiscopate terminated with the life of the king, at least as far as jurisdiction is concerned."—*Lewis.*

"His (Cranmer's) application was granted *durante beneplacito*, and hence I find that the archbishop, in some of his writings, is styled, 'The Commissary of our dread Sovereign Lord, King Edward.'"—Strype, Mem. Cran., p. 202, apud Waterworth, 154.

§ Heylin, 51, 52.—"The whole English nation," says Mr. Lewis, "seems to have denied all ecclesiastical authority as such; holding divine service and the ministration of the sacraments to be by license of the civil power. The bishops accepted commissions from the king to execute their ministry even to the conferring orders. The king is said in them to be the source of all jurisdiction." "So that now," says Strype, (Mem. V. II. P. I. p. 142,) "no bishop might license any one to preach in his own diocese, nay, nor may he preach himself without license: so I have seen licenses to preach granted to the Bishop of Exeter, 1551, and to the Bishops of London and Chichester in 1552," *apud* Cardwell. *Documentary Annals.*

In the twenty-fourth of the forty-two articles of religion agreed upon in the Convocation of 1552, and published by the authority of Edward VI., it is declared, "that it is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of public preaching or administering the sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and sent to execute the same; and those we judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men, who have public authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." This article is the twenty-third of those adopted in 1562, in the reign of Elizabeth, and known as the Thirty-nine articles of Religion. The meaning of this article is evidently Presbyterian; and Burnet, in expounding it, says,* that should a company of Christians, by common consent, decree some of their own members to minister to them in holy things, this is not condemned nor annulled by the article, for "we are sure," says he, "that not only those who penned the articles, but the body of this Church, for above half an age after,† did, notwithstanding these irregularities, acknowledge the foreign churches so constituted to be true churches, as to all the essentials of a church."‡ It is only necessary to read the whole of Burnet's exposition of the twenty-third article, to be convinced how little importance was attached, even in his days, to the regular transmission of ministerial powers. The lawful authority which is to call to the

* Mr. Russell accuses me, in no very measured terms, of having misrepresented Burnet in the following statement of his views on the subject of orders, which statement I have, therefore, copied *verbatim* from the first edition of this work. He represents me as quoting from Burnet, where I only professed to give his meaning. Although I used his own words in so doing, I did not give them as a quotation, nor did I mark them as such by inverted commas. A careful reperusal of Burnet has not convinced me that I have misrepresented him; but as Mr. Russell very strongly asserts the contrary, I insert in the Appendix No. III. the whole of that part of the exposition of the 23d article which has reference to the subject. The impartial reader will find that I have but faintly reflected his Erastian theory. Mr. R. objects against Burnet being quoted as an authority, because of his low churchmanship, and because his "Exposition" was condemned, almost immediately on its appearance, by the lower house of Convocation. With these family quarrels I can, of course, have no concern; and until the Church of England throws off her cameleon nature, Burnet or Pearson may be indifferently referred to as correct expounders of the ambiguous language of her formularies.

† Referring to the doctrine of the Anglican Church on this subject, I observed in the former edition of this work; "This doctrine of the Anglican Church, for at least half an age after, as Bishop Burnet very drily tells us, &c." On this Mr. Russell says, in a note: "Bishop Burnet says no such thing." (Refutation, p. 15,) Unless the doctrine of the Church was at variance with its practice, I think that Bishop Burnet does make the statement I have attributed to him.

‡ Exposition, art. 23, p. 257. See Appendix III.

ministry is, according to him, the body of the pastors assembled, and acting agreeably to the laws of the State, without at all insisting on the necessity for these pastors themselves to have had any thing like regular ordination.* Thus, he says, "The article does not resolve this (lawful authority) into any particular constitution, but leaves the matter open and at large for such accidents as had happened, and such as might still happen. They who drew it, had the state of the different reformed churches before their eyes, that had been differently reformed ;† and although their own had been less forced to go out of the beaten path than any other, yet they knew that all things among themselves had not gone according to those rules that ought to be sacred in regular times. Necessity has no law, and is a law to itself." That such was the doctrine of the Church of England for a long period subsequent to its birth, he thus expressly states, while making a supposition which had already been verified in England: "If it should happen that princes or States should take up such a jealousy of their own authority, and should apprehend that the suffering of their subjects to go elsewhere for regular ordination, might bring them under

* Here Mr. Russell observes: "Dr. Kenrick again wilfully misrepresents Bishop Burnet in saying that the lawful authority which is to call to the ministry is, according to him, (Burnet) 'the body of the pastors assembled and acting agreeably to the laws of the State, without at all insisting on the necessity for these persons themselves to have had any thing like regular ordination.' Burnet is here speaking generally of lawful authority, which, he affirms, is that rule which the body of the pastors or bishops and clergy of a church shall settle, being met in a body, under the due respect of the powers that God had set over them; and for the correctness of this definition, as opposed to that which places all jurisdiction in the Pope, he appeals to the decrees of the first general councils, by which the concerns of every province were to be settled in the province itself: what need was there of his insisting on the necessity of the bishops and clergy being ordained? What had this to do with the question in hand? Does he not assume throughout that they had regular ordination? Is not this fact implied in the very designation 'bishops and clergy?' Again: Dr. Kenrick lays great stress on the admission of Burnet, that the Reformers 'knew that all things among themselves had not gone according to those rules that ought to be sacred in regular times.' If Dr. Kenrick wishes the bishop to be understood to say, that the Reformers admitted the invalidity of Parker's consecration, he knows that Burnet meant nothing of the kind, and that he defends the validity of the English orders." *Refutation*, pp. 13—14. I refer the reader to the extract from Burnet, in the appendix, and leave him to judge between Mr. Russell and myself. I shall merely say, in reply to the last sentence of the above quotation, that I did not inquire whether Burnet admitted Parker's consecration or not; nor did I, as Mr. Russell would give the reader to understand, insinuate any thing on the subject.

† Hence the English "Reformers," in framing the articles of their creed, had in view, not the Word of God, or the teachings of antiquity, but the state of the different reformed churches at home and abroad, and they made principles to suit the accidents that had happened, and might happen again.

some dependence on those that had ordained them: and if, upon other political reasons, they had just cause of being jealous of that, and should thereupon hinder any such thing, in that case, neither our reformers nor their successors, for near eighty years after those articles were published, did ever question the constitution of such churches."*

These Presbyterian principles regarding the non-necessity of orders, regularly transmitted in an unbroken chain of succession, not only prevailed during the latter years of Henry VIII., and during the whole reign of Edward VI., but were adopted by the bishops of Elizabeth's time. These men had been engaged in most of the religious changes made in the reigns of the two before named monarchs; and the identity of belief on this point between the Convocations of 1548 and 1562 is shown by the adoption of the article above referred to, by both assemblies; as also by the addition made to the twenty-sixth of Edward's articles, which is the twenty-fifth of those of Elizabeth, or thirty-nine articles. This addition is the more remarkable, as in Edward's article, there was no express exclusion of any visible sign or ceremony in the conferring of orders; but, in the last mentioned article, it is declared that "those five, commonly called sacraments, that is to say, confirmation, penance, orders, matrimony, and extreme unction, are not to be accounted for sacraments of the Gospel; being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed by Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, *for they have no visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.*"† The imposition of hands is certainly a visible sign; by it Timothy received the grace which St. Paul admonished him to stir up within him (2 Tim. 1, 6). The framers of this article must have had some very powerful motive to make them assign, in 1562, this ground as the motive for excluding orders from the

* Burnet's Exp. art. 23, p. 260.

† Heylin, Appendix, p. 189. "It appears, that the draft of the thirty-nine articles was presented to the Convocation by Archbishop Parker, and that the Convocation approved them unanimously. Archbishop Parker presided, and was the great mover of all the proceedings."—Butler's Historical Memoirs of the English Catholics, vol. i. p. 288. London, 1822. Mr. Evans calls my statement of the articles "garbled." And yet I gave the whole of the 23d article, and the whole of the addition to the 25th article, that is, all that I professed to give. It is to be regretted that writers, otherwise respectable, will permit themselves the use of language which is as unjust as it is offensive.

number of the sacraments. Mr. Evans refers to one of the Homilies of the Church of England, which according to the thirty-fifth article, contains "a godly and wholesome doctrine," for the reason why order is not called a sacrament. According to the homily, it is not a sacrament, because "though the ordering of ministers hath this visible sign, (laying on of hands,) and promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other sacraments besides the two above named, (Eucharist and Baptism) do." Now the article says, that order is not a sacrament, because it has "not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God."*

Mr. Evans refers to the thirty-sixth article, in which the ordinal of Edward VI. is recognized as containing all things necessary to such consecration and ordering, and in which all who had been, or were thereafter to, be consecrated and ordered, according to the rule of said book, were declared to be rightly ordered and lawfully consecrated and ordered. And then he asks, "how is it possible in the face of these articles thus adopted, to assert that he" (Cranmer) "and his fellow bishops did not hold the necessity of Episcopal ordination, or to imagine that they did not at least believe themselves to possess it?" Might not they, as well as Hooker, have excepted the case of inevitable necessity? May they not have looked on their case as such a one, and have believed, with Burnet, "that necessity is a law to itself?"

The assertion of Burnet, regarding the sentiments on the

* I must beg leave to decline the impossible task of reconciling the formularies of the Anglican church. A modern writer, who has mastered the subject, thus describes them:

"He (Reding) saw that the profession of faith contained in the articles was but a patchwork of bits of orthodoxy, Lutheranism, Calvinism and Zuinglism; and this too on no principle; that it was the work of accident, if there be such a thing as accident, that it had come down in the particular shape in which the English church now receives it, when it might have come down in any other shape; that it was but a toss up that Anglicans of the day were not Calvinists, or Presbyterians, or Lutherans, equally well as Episcopalians. This historical fact did but clench the difficulty, or rather impossibility of saying what the faith of the English Church was. On almost every point the authoritative standard of doctrine was vague or inconsistent, and there was an imposing weight of external testimony in favour of opposite interpretations.—They (the articles) distinctly receive the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith only, which the prayer book virtually opposes in every one of its offices. They refer to the homilies as authority, yet the homilies speak of the books of the Apocrypha as inspired, which the articles implicitly deny. The articles about ordination are in their spirit contrary to the ordination service. One article on the sacraments speaks the doctrine of Melancthon, another that of Calvin. One article speaks of the Church's authority in controversies of faith, yet another makes Scripture the ultimate appeal."—*Loss and Gain*, pp. 113, 199. London, 1848.

present subject, which prevailed in England for eighty years after the rise of the Anglican communion, is confirmed by two facts mentioned by Courayer. In the year 1610, James I. of England, being desirous of introducing episcopacy into Scotland, caused some Presbyterian ministers of that country to receive episcopal consecration at the hands, I believe, of Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. The question arose, whether they should be re-ordained presbyters, or be at once ordained bishops. Some, at least one, of the English bishops maintained the necessity of re-ordination, inasmuch as they had never received these orders (deaconship and priesthood) from a bishop; but "Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury," says Courayer, "maintained that the ordination given by priests, ought to be esteemed valid, though it was not administered by bishops, for otherwise the greatest part of the reformed churches would be found to want ministers."*

Mr. Evans calls in question the opinion here attributed to Bancroft, because this latter, as a high churchman, must at least "have held with Hooker, that, cases of inevitable necessity excepted, none may ordain but only bishops; by the imposition of their hands it is, that the Church giveth the power of order both unto presbyters and deacons."† Nothing is ascribed to Bancroft, which, if Mr. Evans adopts Hooker's principle, might not be ascribed to himself. What constitutes "inevitable necessity," may be variously estimated. Mr. Evans has, then, no motive to call this statement in question, resting, as it does, on unsuspicious authority. This gentleman insinuates a charge of suppression against me, because the words, "though it was not administered by bishops," should have been, according to him, "when bishops were wanting to administer it." I copied the English translator of Courayer, whom this latter complimented on the fidelity of his translation, to whom Mr. Evans himself refers, and whom he should have consulted, before charging me with an unfaithful representation of the passage.‡ Whatever were the words used by Bancroft, nothing is more evident than that he did not regard the episcopal character as absolutely necessary for the transmission of ministerial powers.

Mr. Russell accuses me of disingenuousness, because I omitted

* Courayer, p. 22. † Eccl. Pol. b. viii. c. xiv. § ii.

‡ Williams' translation of Le Courayer, p. 22, ed. London, 1725, found in Philadelphia Library.

to state another reason, attributed to Bancroft, and which forms part of the sentence from which my quotation was made. He also intimates a similar charge, because in referring to Collier I did not notice Heylin's account of Bancroft's motive for not re-ordaining the Scotch presbyters. This motive, which is also assigned by Courayer, was Bancroft's opinion, that episcopacy supplied all the inferior orders. As this second motive of Bancroft does nowise affect the one first assigned, and has no bearing whatever on the point in hand, I submit that there was no disingenuousness in passing it over in silence; and Mr. Russell must have been very anxious to impeach my trust-worthiness, when he urged the omission as a fault. Mr. Evans says that Bancroft is a witness against me, because, by requiring the Scotch presbyters to come to London for the purpose of receiving episcopal consecration, he showed his conviction, that not only presbyters could not ordain bishops, but that he himself was a link in the chain of apostolical succession, and consequently, that Parker must have been consecrated. I shall leave this argument to its own merits. On this occasion Mr. Evans insinuates a charge of unfairness against me, because, according to him, I did not give the page whence my extract from Courayer was taken. On such slight grounds is this gentleman disposed to indulge in offensive imputations. And yet even this ground is an oversight of his own. *I did give the page!*

In the year 1664, two years after the ordinal of Edward had been altered to its present form, four Presbyterian ministers, regularly ordained according to the discipline of their sect, came to England for the purpose of receiving episcopal consecration.* They were, however, obliged to submit to be re-ordained deacons and priests. This opposite line of conduct, in circumstances precisely similar, shows that a silent reformation had taken place in the minds of the Anglican hierarchy on the necessity of episcopal ordination. Whatever effort may be made to account for this very remarkable difference, it must be acknowledged that these facts furnish a strong confirmation of Burnet's assertion.

Were further proof necessary to show the light in which the necessity of episcopal ordination, for the purpose of transmitting the powers of the ministry, was held by the bishops of Elizabeth's reign, assembled in Convocation in 1562, just three years after

* Collier, v. 2, p. 887.

the date assigned to the Lambeth consecration, it may be found in the translation of the Bible, prepared for the press principally by the exertions of Parker,* and published by authority of this Convocation. It is known as the Bishops' Bible. In it, Acts xiv. 23, was thus translated: "And when they had *ordained elders by election* in every congregation." The Greek word χειροτονησαντες, thus rendered "ordaining by election," had been constantly understood in the Church to express the imposition of hands, by which ministerial powers were conferred. This translation was not only an unauthorized innovation—an attempt to give this passage a sense it never had in the Church,—but, in the circumstances in which it was made, shows the earnest desire of the translators to make the Bible echo the principles of Luther, referred to in the beginning of this chapter.

In the former edition of this work, I stated that the above mistranslation was found in the first, and all subsequent editions of the Bishops' Bible, up to the time when the present authorized version was published. Mr. Russell says it is found in the first edition, that of 1568, but that in the second edition, which appeared in 1572, the translation "resembles that in our present version." I have, accordingly, confined the assertion to the first edition, as that furnishes all the ground for the argument I require. In this instance I appear to have followed Ward, who says: "These words, 'by election,' were thrust into the text by Tyndal, in King Henry VIII.'s time, and retained in it by Cranmer, and all the pretended reformers of King Edward VI.'s reign; so here in Queen Elizabeth's Bibles, as may be seen in these editions of 1560, 1577, 1579, 1598, 1599. Nor were they obliterated until King James I. made a new translation."† Mr. Russell's statement is not entirely at variance with that of Ward, who does not expressly speak of the edition of 1572, although in the concluding observation he may be supposed to include it. Mr. Russell says that I did not know the meaning of the Greek word χειροτονεω, which is susceptible of the meaning given to it in the edition of 1568; and that my remarks on the subject throw a curious light

* "Cranmer's version becoming scarce, a new version was resolved upon. The task was allotted to many; the celebrated Mathew Parker, then Archbishop of Canterbury, superintended and regulated their labours. It is sometimes called Parker's Bible, but is generally known by the appellation of the Bishops' Bible."—*Butler's Hist. Mem.*, vol. 1, p. 288, 1822.

† England's Reformation, a poem, by Thomas Ward, pp. 310, 311, note.

on American scholarship. But Mr. Russell must admit, that in Acts xiv. 23, χειροτονησαντες does *not* mean to ordain by election, but "*to ordain.*"—(Authorized version.) The principles of Luther, and not the example of Xenophon, influenced the translators, as is evident from all that has been advanced in this chapter, and much more that might be adduced, to show the efforts made by the Anglican Reformers to undervalue, if not entirely set aside, the rite of ordination. Besides, Mr. Russell is mistaken in supposing that any classical author uses this word, χειροτονεω, to express the idea, "*ordain by election,*" which is the translation I found fault with.

In fine, not only the public acts, but the personal character of the English Reformers, during the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, justify the conclusion which Dr. McCrie, a Presbyterian writer, has expressed—"The first English Reformers, by no means considered ordination by the parent church, or descending from the parent church, as necessary. They would have laughed at the man who would have asserted seriously that the imposition of the hands of the bishop was essential to the validity of ordination; they would not have owned that person as a protestant, who would have ventured to insinuate, that, where this was wanting there was no Christian ministry; no ordinance; no church; and, perhaps, no salvation. The private opinions of the first English Reformers were similar to those of the Reformers of Switzerland and Geneva; Hooper, in a letter, dated Feb. 8, 1550, informs Bullinger that the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of Rochester, Ely, St. David's, Lincoln, and Bath, agreed, *in all things*, with the Helvetic churches. Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, in a letter to Gualter, does the same."

CHAPTER III.

FIRST ANGLICAN BISHOPS REPROACHED BY CATHOLIC CONTEMPORARY WRITERS WITH NOT HAVING RECEIVED CONSECRATION.

Among the earliest public denials of the consecration of the first Anglican Bishops in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, is that of Bishop Bonner, which is of more than ordinary importance, both on account of the notoriety of the fact, as of the Act of Parliament to which it gave occasion.

The circumstance is thus narrated by Ward: "By the first session of that Parliament, 5 Eliz. 1, power was given to any bishop in the realm, to tender the oath of supremacy, enacted, 1 Eliz., to any ecclesiastical person within his diocese; and the refuser was to incur a *præmunire*. By virtue of this statute, Mr. Robert Horn, pretended Bishop of Winchester, tenders the oath to Dr. Bonner, Bishop of London, but deprived by Queen Elizabeth, and then a prisoner in the Marshalsea, which was within the diocese of Winchester: Bonner refuses to take it. Horn certifies his refusal into the King's Bench: whereupon Bonner was indicted upon the statute. He prays judgment, whether he might not give in evidence on this issue: 'that he was not culpable, because the said Horn, called Bishop of Winchester, was not bishop when he tendered the oath.' And it was resolved by all the judges at Sergeant's Inn, in Judge Catlin, the Chief Justice's chamber, 'That if the verity and matter be so, indeed, he should well be received to give in evidence upon this issue, and the jury should try it.' Now, what the trial was appears by that he was not condemned, nor ever any further troubled for that case, though he was a man especially aimed at. And at the next sessions of that Parliament, which was the 8th of Elizabeth, they were forced, for want, you see, of a better character, to beg they might be declared bishops by act of Parliament."* The account given by the protestant historian, Fuller, in his Church History, coincides with that of

* See Abridg. of Dyer's Reports, 7 Eliz., fol. 234, quoted by Ward in his *Errata to the Protestant Bible*, p. 71. Philadelphia, 1824.

Ward. I shall only quote that part of it that throws light on what was the real difficulty of the case. After mentioning that Bonner's counsel pleaded three legal informalities, as a bar to the indictment, which were, however, over-ruled by the judges, he says,—"The main matter, which was so much debated among all the judges, in the Lord Cateline, his chamber, was this:

"Whether Bonner could give in evidence of that issue that he had pleaded of not guilty, that Horne Bishop of Winchester was not a bishop, *tempore oblationis sacramenti*, at the time he tendered the oath unto Bonner.

"And it was resolved by them all, that if the truth of the matter was so indeed, that he might give that in evidence upon that issue, and that the jury might trie whether he was a bishop then or not."*

After stating the interference of the Queen's Parliament, he says:—"The seasonable interposing of the statute made it a drawn battell between Horne and Bonner."†

Not only was Bonner thus exempted from the *præmunire*, to which his refusal to take the oath of supremacy would have subjected him, had Horn been able to prove that he was a bishop; but in the act of 8th Elizabeth, referred to, a proviso is contained, exempting all who had refused that oath, or who should refuse it before the end of that present session of Parliament, from all proceedings at law on account of such refusal. This denial of Horn's episcopal character is consequently, a most important event; and we have only to examine what were the motives on which Bonner denied that Horn was a bishop.

The advocates of Anglican ordinations deny that Bonner's plea affords evidence that Horn was not a validly consecrated bishop, at the time of tendering the oath to Bonner; because, they assert, this denial was grounded on a mere legal informality in Horn's consecration.

The Register of Archbishop Parker, called the Lambeth Register, states, that Horn was consecrated by Parker according to the ordinal of Edward VI., which had been abolished in the reign of Queen Mary, and was not revived, at least in name, until subsequently to the date assigned for Horn's consecration. This legal

* Fuller, Church History, Book IX., p. 80.—He also quotes Dyer, fol. 234. Mich. 6 and 7 Eliz. placito 15.

† Ib. p. 80.

defect, it is said, was Bonner's motive for denying the episcopal character of Horn.

It is, indeed, certain that Bonner denied that Horn was a bishop, such as the laws of England recognized; because in law he could only plead a legal defect. That he chiefly relied, or that he relied at all, on the non-revival of Edward's ordinal, to disprove Horn's consecration is not only without proof, but against the authority of his own MS. given by Strype, in which not a word regarding Edward's ordinal is found. In that paper he denies that Horn was consecrated by an archbishop and two bishops, agreeably to the provisions of 25 Henry VIII. c. 20.

Dr. Lingard states as one of the motives of Bonner's plea, that Parker, Horn's consecrator, had been consecrated in defiance of the statute of 25 Henry VIII.* But this is a mistake. It does not appear that any reference was made to Parker, who, if the Lambeth Register may be believed, was consecrated conformably to the provisions of that statute, which only required a bishop to be consecrated by an archbishop and two bishops, or by four bishops. Horn is stated in the Register to have been consecrated by Archbishop Parker and three bishops, and Parker to have been consecrated by four bishops; so that neither consecration was a violation of the provisions of that act.

Besides, it can be shewn, that the ordinal had been revived previous to the date assigned for Horn's consecration. I am aware how confidently the non-revival of Edward's ordinal is asserted by the defenders of Anglican ordinations; also, that it is adduced by Ward, for the purpose of disproving the consecration of Parker at Lambeth; and that other Catholic writers have regarded it as one of the causes which led to the enactment of the celebrated statute of 8th Elizabeth. I cannot, however, but think, that, had Bonner's denial rested on no other ground than mere legal informalities in Horn's consecration, it would have been disallowed. Admitting, for the moment, that such was the case, this defect would have been supplied by the clause which is found in the commission of 6th December, and which commission—whatever others may think of its authenticity,—is admitted by all who maintain Parker's consecration, at Lambeth, on the 17th of that month. This clause, generally called the "Supplying Clause," is as follows:

* History of England, Vol. VII., Note G., Ed. London, 1844.

"Supplying nevertheless by our supreme royal authority, from our mere motion and certain knowledge, if in those things which you shall do according to our mandate, or in you, or any one of you, or in your condition, state, or faculty, for the accomplishment of the foregoing, there be any thing wanting, or to be wanting, of what is required or necessary in this case by the statutes of of this realm, or by the ecclesiastical laws—the circumstance of the time and the necessity of the thing so demanding it."

Whatever may be thought of Her Majesty's power to relax the ecclesiastical laws, no one can deny that the above dispensation would have been considered as sufficient to remove all merely legal objections to the act done under the commission in which it is found. We have, moreover, the following certificate signed by six lawyers, which Anglican writers produce among the documentary evidence of Parker's Lambeth consecration.

"We, whose names that are hereunder subscribed, think, in our judgments, that by this commission, in this form penned, as well the Queen's Majesty may lawfully authorize the persons within named to the effect specified, as that the said persons may exercise the act of confirming and consecrating in the same to them committed."

This supplying clause was, then, judged, by those most competent to express an opinion, amply sufficient to remove all the merely legal objections that might be urged against the consecration. There is, besides, no proof,—at least I have seen none—that the defect urged by Bonner, was the non-revival of Edward's ordinal. This is apparent from the various conjectures which Anglican writers have made, as to the nature of that defect, as well as from Mason's acknowledgment that no reason was assigned by Bonner's counsel.* Mason's words are: "Bonner's counsel, though they pleaded Horn was no bishop, yet, for aught appears by Dyer, they gave no reason for it. It seems, therefore, that the judges allowed them longer time to produce their reasons, that so the dignity of the bishops might shine more clear." To this Erastus Senior, (Lewgar,) answers: "Dr. Heylin, saith, Bonner's counsel did give their reasons, viz. that the form of Edward VI. had been repealed by Queen Mary, 'and so remained at Horn's pretended consecration,' (Part 2, f. 173,) but I suppose it a mistake of his;

* Lib. iii. c. ii. n. 6, p. 381.

for it is not the use, in the entering of a plea, to give a reason for it; for that is to be shown and pleaded at the hearing, which this cause never came to; and therefore that could be no reason of the delay of sentence."*

In his life of Parker, Strype gives a letter from Parker to Cecil, Elizabeth's Secretary of State, on the margin of which the latter is said to have written: "This (Edward's ordinal) is not revived by parliament." What evidence have we that this note is in the handwriting of Cecil? It does not appear to have been produced by any one before Strype—a not very trustworthy authority, according to Mr. Williams, the translator of Courayer, of whom Strype was a contemporary. This letter was first published at a time when the ordination controversy was most vigorously carried on; and it exactly supplied, what was then so much wanted, a proof that the ordinal was not revived by 1 Eliz. And yet in Bonner's MS., given by Strype, containing his reasons for refusing the oath, tendered to him by Horn, this supposed non-revival of Edward's ordinal is not so much as mentioned. It is strange that Bonner's law advisers should have overlooked the only real ground on which they might maintain that Horn was no bishop before the law. This letter is not found in Burnet, who gives ten letters that passed between Parker, Cecil, and Sir Nicholas Bacon, on occasion of Parker's promotion to Canterbury.

Besides, there appears sufficient motive for denying the fact so confidently asserted by the modern defenders of Anglican orders, and too easily credited by some Catholic writers, that the ordinal of Edward VI. had not been revived previously to the act of 8 Eliz. The revival of the ordinal, previously to Parker's alleged consecration, by the act of 1 Elizabeth, (1559,) may be safely inferred from the following facts.

In the year 1548, an act of Parliament, 2 & 3 Edward VI., was passed, establishing the Book of Common Prayer.† Another act passed in 1548, for the ordering of Ecclesiastical ministers, by which "six prelates and six other men of this realm, learned in God's law," were appointed to draw up a form of ordination.‡ This form, known as the ordinal of Edward VI., was annexed to the

* Erastus Senior, pa. 46, London, 1844. (This work is attributed by the editor to Peter Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin, whereas Dr. Milner, (Letter to Dr. Elrington) and Tierney, (Dodd, vol. ii. p. cccvi. note,) attribute it to Lewgar.)

† Appendix V. ‡ App. VI.

new Book of Common Prayer, substituted for the one previously authorized by an act of Parliament in 1552,* 5 & 6 Edward VI. And to it was added "a form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to be of like force, authority and value as the same like aforesaid Book, entitled the Book of Common Prayer." By an act of 1553, 1 Mary, these three acts *along with several other acts of Edward's reign*, were severally repealed.†

An act of Parliament of 1 Eliz., 1559, repealed the act of 1 Mary, 1553, as far as regarded the Book of Common Prayer, in these words:—

"Be it, therefore, enacted by authority of this present Parliament, that the said statute of repeal, and every thing therein contained only concerning the said book, and the service and administration of the sacraments, rites and ceremonies contained or appointed in or by the said book, shall be void and of none effect, from and after the feast of the Nativity of St. John Baptist next coming."

Was the ordinal of Edward VI., annexed by the act of 1552, to the Book of Common Prayer, included in the Book revived by the act of 1 Eliz.? Such appears to me to be the case.

By the act of 1552, 5 & 6 Edward, this ordinal was added to the Book of Common Prayer, of which it thenceforward must be conceived to form a part. In the table of contents of that book, appeared as the 21st article: "The form and manner of consecrating bishops." In the edition of 1552, the printer's name, according to the custom of that time, is found at the end of the book, *after the ordinal*, which proves that the ordinal was incorporated with the Book of Common Prayer.. This is admitted by Mason, who, speaking of the ordinal of Edward VI., says: "Which, as at this day, so then was not esteemed *another* distinct book from the Book of Common Prayer; but they were both jointly reputed as *one book*, and so established by act of Parliament. In the first of Queen Mary, by the repealing of this act, the book was disannulled, but it was *established* again in the *first* of Queen Elizabeth, and *confirmed* in the eighth, of her reign."‡—Speaking of the ordinal of Edward VI., Heylin says: "It was approved of and confirmed as a part thereof (i. e. of the Book of Common

* App. VII. † App. VIII. ‡ Mason, lib. 2, c. 11, p. 94.

Prayer) by act of Parliament, An. 5, Edw. 6, cap. 1, and of this book it is we find mention in the 36th article of Queen Elizabeth's time, in which it is declared; that 'whosoever were consecrated, and ordered, according to the rites thereof, should be reputed and adjudged to be lawfully consecrated and rightly ordered.'"* Had the non-revival of Edward's ordinal been the sole ground on which Bonner rested his plea—were this the principal defect in Horn's consecration, it is not easy to conceive why Strype should assign a different motive, namely, that Horn was not ordained by an archbishop, according to the statute of Henry VIII.,†—while Heylin and Collier assign the one generally received, namely, that the ordinal of Edward VI. was not revived at the time;‡—both which positions Courayer himself shows to be untenable, saying of the latter;—"This second is not a jot truer than the other."§ Nor would Courayer himself have been put to the trouble of *conjecturing*, that Bonner's plea was grounded on the fact, that the ordinal of Edward VI., although *actually* revived by the 1st of Elizabeth, was not a legal instrument of ordination, inasmuch as it was not revived *by name!* His statement of the difficulty, is as follows: "By the Statute," says he, "of 1552, Edward VI. had added a form for consecrating bishops, priests, and deacons, to the Book of Common Prayer, and it was from that time to make part of the said book. In 1553 this book was abolished, together with the form for the ordination of bishops. In 1559, when Queen Elizabeth caused the Statute of 1553 to be repealed, there is express mention made of the Book of Common Prayer, but not of the additions that had been made to it, i. e. of the form of ordination, because it was looked upon as a part of the said book. This omission is the occasion of all the difficulty in this point; for this form having been abolished by name in Queen Mary's reign, and not re-established by name in Queen Elizabeth's, Bonner's counsel pretended that the ordination was null,‖ and Horn was no bishop. This seemed of consequence enough to be laid before Parliament in 1566, and it occasioned the last statute that I have quoted (1566), by which the ordinations made in Queen Eliza-

* History of the Reformation, p. 83.

† Strype; annals, T. 3, c. 34, p. 342.

‡ Heylin; History of the Reformation, Elizabeth, p. 173. Collier, part 2, p. 493,

§ P. 122.

‖ There is nothing to show that Bonner's counsel advanced this as the ground of their denial that Horn was a bishop.

beth's time, are declared good and valid, notwithstanding any pretences to the contrary."

"The Parliament, in determining about the validity of the English ordinations, declared expressly that the form of ordination had been *re-established in* 1559. And if we consider the case seriously, they could not have determined otherwise. For by the statute of 1552, the form of ordination was made a part of the Book of Common Prayer."*

These observations and authorities shew that the ordinal of Edward VI. formed a part of the Book of Common Prayer, with which it had been incorporated by the act of 1552; and, consequently, that the revival of this latter necessarily implied the revival of the ordinal. To this, it is replied, that the statute of 1 Eliz. repealed that of 1 Mary, "only concerning said book," which words are confidently relied on, as if they intimated a distinction between the Book of Common Prayer, as established by the act of 5 Edward VI., and the ordinal, annexed thereto by the said act. A simple inspection of the two acts of 1 Mary and 1 Eliz. will show that these words "only concerning said book," have an entirely different reference. The act of 1 Mary, as before stated, repealed most, if not all, the acts affecting religion, which had been passed in the reign of Edward VI.; the act of 1 Eliz. did not repeal the act of 1 Mary entirely, but "only concerning said book,"—*i. e.* the Book of Common Prayer, of which the ordinal was a part,—leaving the revival of the other acts of Edward VI. to be subjects of subsequent legislation.†

To resume: by the 1 of Mary, all that had been done by the 5 Edward VI., was repealed: the act of 1 Eliz. repealed that of 1 Mary, "only in regard of said book," and, consequently, as far as the Book of Common Prayer was concerned, brought back things to the state in which they were at the time of Edward's death. This was the result which the framers of the act of 1 Eliz. had in view; this was their obvious intention; and this they expressed in clear language. We may hence safely conclude, that the non-revival by name, as Courayer conjectures, of an ordinal actually revived, could not have been the difficulty which all acknowledge to have existed in Horn's case.

* P. 126.

† Erastus Sr, does not appear to have consulted the Act of 1 Mary, from which these words are taken; as he gives them a different meaning from what they evidently bear.

These considerations fully justify the conclusion that the ordinal of Edward VI., was revived by 1 Eliz., and was, consequently, a legal instrument of consecration. In the contrary supposition, how could this difficulty have escaped the notice of the Queen's legal advisers? or of the six counsellors who are said to have been consulted on the occasion? Does not this consultation, in the supposition of the genuine character of that document, show that great importance was attached to Parker's consecration; that considerable anxiety was felt on the occasion; and, hence, that no defect which the crown or its advisers could remove, would have been suffered to remain, and cast a cloud over the rising glories of Anglican episcopacy. Would the government have been *afraid*,—for this is the word used by Fuller,—to commit the determination of the question between Bonner and Horn to the decision, first of a Middlesex and then of a Surrey jury; especially at a time when popular enthusiasm was so strong in favour of the new order of things; and popular hatred so violent against the professors of the old religion? Among these none was more obnoxious than Bonner,* on account of the part he took in the proceedings against the Protestants in the preceding reign. Would an act of parliament have been passed, which, if not absolutely needed, inflicted a most serious injury on the character of the Anglican prelates, and has fixed on them the name of "parliamentary bishops," which was applied to them by their contemporaries, as it is in our days to their successors?

Mr. Russell denies that the motive assigned to Bonner rests solely on conjecture. "But, in fact," says he, "unless Strype and Collier are faithless historians, and the document to which they refer is deficient in genuineness and authenticity, there is no room for conjecture, on one point at least, and that *the* one which I am concerned to dispute. Both these writers tell us what were Bonner's chief objections, *on the authority of his own MS*, and neither of them so much as hints that he denied the *fact of Horn's consecration*, or of Parker's, whose name does not once occur in the transaction. It appears from their statements, particularly Collier's, that Bonner impugned the validity and legality of Horn's consecration,—that he pleaded that it was not a canonical and

* "It was not safe for him (Bonner,) to go abroad, lest the people should stone him to death."—*Mason*, 105. The same is stated in Bonner's manuscript, printed by Strype.

lawful consecration: but if this be admitted (and Dr. Kenrick does not deny it) it affords a strong, and I may add, a conclusive argument, that Bonner acknowledged that Horn had received *a* consecration." In a note, he adds: "It is not true, as Dr. Kenrick asserts, that Strype assigns to Bonner a different motive from that ascribed to him by Collier. Strype assigns one reason, *i. e.* that Horn (not Parker, as Dr. Kenrick pretends) was not ordained by an archbishop and three bishops: Collier *also assigns this;* but with another, *i. e.* that the ordinal of Edward was not revived at the time."*

The MS. given by Strype, and alleged to have been written by Bonner, makes no mention whatever of the non-revival of Edward's ordinal, nor does it refer to it. It assigns a different motive—that Horn was not consecrated by an archbishop and two bishops. As far as I have been able to discover, the other motive attributed to Bonner—the non-revival of Edward's ordinal,—is a conjecture, unsustained by any historical monument.

That Courayer did not regard the point as settled by the authority of preceding writers, appears from his language, as well as from his ingenious conjecture. Let the reader examine that portion of the text to which Mr. Russell's note refers, and which, in this respect, I have preserved unaltered in the present edition, and he will see, that I said that Strype assigned a different motive from that assigned by Heylin, and that it was only incidentally that Collier was afterwards mentioned as assigning the ground relied on by Mason and Heylin.

Mr. Russell is mistaken in asserting that Bonner acknowledged that Horn had received *a* consecration. There is nothing in the document referred to which warrants this supposition. He denies his consecration in these words: "Item, that the said Mr. Robert Horne not being lawful Bishop of Winchester, but an usurper, invader, and unlawful possessioner thereof, as well for that according to the laws of the Catholic Church, and the statutes and ordinances of this realm, was not elected, consecrated, or provided, etc."† He afterwards refers to 25 Henry VIII. c. 20, as already mentioned.

While combating, like a skilful advocate, my inference from the dispute in question, and the construction of the act of 1 Eliza-

* Ref. pp. 24, 25, and note. † Strype, 1, p. 379.

beth, on which it rests, Mr. Evans says: "His construction of the statute of the 1 Elizabeth, may be right—it has the authority of the act of the 8th (Elizabeth) with it: but it is not so clear that nobody could even doubt it."* The judges and juries of Elizabeth's time would certainly not have called it in question. But then, he says, Catholic divines, and among others, Stapleton, have denied the revival of Edward's ordinal by the 1st Eliz., and I am the first, he believes, who has attempted to maintain the contrary. In this, however, Mr. Evans is mistaken. Le Quien has expressed the same opinion, and he quotes another writer to the same effect. Those Catholic writers, and they are certainly the greatest number, who have denied the revival of Edward's ordinal by the act of 1 Elizabeth, may have too hastily credited the positive assertions of such writers as Heylin†—whose description of the act of 8th Elizabeth is so erroneous—or may have been misled, as appears certain in the case of Erastus Senior, by the words "only concerning said book," in the act of 1 Elizabeth. To the argument *ad verecundiam* from the novelty of my interpretation, I can only reply by referring once more to the authorities and facts adduced in support of the opinion I have embraced.

So notorious was the defect of episcopal consecration in the first English bishops, that a reference to a jury was regarded as a perilous experiment. And not without reason, if we can believe Dr. Heylin, who says, "it was advised that the decision of the point should rather be referred to the following Parliament, for fear that such a weighty matter might miscarry by a contrary jury, of whose either partiality, or insufficiency, there had been some proofs made before, touching the grants made by King Edward's Bishops; of which a great many were made under this pretence,

* Essays, p. 113.

† Heylin's account of the act of 8th Elizabeth, is calculated to mislead—"According to this sound advice, the business came under consideration in the following Parliament, which began on the 30th of September, where all the particulars being fully and particularly discoursed upon, it was first declared, 'That their not restoring that book to the former power, in terms significant and express, was but *casus omissus*; and, secondly, that by the statutes 5th and 6th Edward VI., it hath been added to the Book of Common Prayer and administration of the sacraments, as a member of it, or at least an appendant to it, and therefore, by 1st Elizabeth, was restored again, together with the said Book of Common Prayer, intentionally, at least, if not *in terminis*; but being the words in the said statute were not clear enough to remove all doubts, they did therefore revive it now."—*Heylin*, apud Evans, p. 115. A reference to the Act itself will show, that what Heylin appears to quote from that Act is not found in it.

that the granters were not actually bishops, nor legally possessed of their several sees."*

Whatever was the motive of Bonner's denial, it is certain, that previous to 1566, a formal and public denial was put on record, that the first Anglican bishops were bishops, and that, as if to prevent any lapse of time from causing this important fact to be called into question, the English Parliament passed the following act, by which, says Dr. Heylin, "the church is strongly settled on her natural pillars,"†—words which forcibly suggest the application to that church of the inspired phrase, "of the earth, earthly."

"Forasmuch as divers questions by overmuch boldness of speech and talk amongst many of the common sort of people being unlearned, hath lately grown upon the making and consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops within this realm, whether the same were, and be duly and orderly done according to the law or not, which is much tending to the slander of all the state of the clergy, being of the greatest states of this realm; Therefore, for the avoiding of such slanderous speech, and to the intent that every man that is willing to know the truth, may plainly understand that the same evil speech and talk is not grounded upon any just matter or cause, it is thought convenient hereby partly to touch such authorities as do allow and approve the making and consecrating of the same Archbishops and Bishops to be duly and orderly done according to the laws of this realm, and thereupon further to provide for the more surety thereof, as hereafter shall be expressed.

"First, it is very well known to all degrees of this realm, that the late King of the most famous memory, King Henry the Eighth, as well as by all the Clergy, then of this realm, in their several convocations, as also by all the Lords, spiritual and temporal, and

* Heylin, 173-4.—Remarking on Dr. Heylin's observation as to the cause of Horn's unwillingness to let the matter go before a jury, "for fear that such a matter might miscarry by a contrary jury," Lewgar says: "But this could be no reason; because the decision of the point in law, upon which rested the whole difficulty, and which alone could be referred to the decision of the Parliament, (viz. whether the form of Edward VI. were legal, or whether one consecrated by that form were a bishop,) was not to be put to the jury, but to be determined by the judges, and the jury to try only the matter of fact, whether he were so consecrated. If, therefore, the judges had delivered it for law, that Horn, if so consecrated, was a bishop, and he could have proved he was so consecrated (as was easy for him to do, if the records be true,) the jury must have found him a bishop."—Erastus, Sr., p. 47, London, 1844.

† Heylin; History Reform., Eliz., p. 174.

Commons assembled in divers of his Parliaments, was justly and rightfully recognised and acknowledged to have the supreme power, jurisdiction, order, rule and authority over all the estate Ecclesiastical of the same, and the same power, jurisdiction and authority did use accordingly—and that at the Parliament holden at Westminster, in the first year of our sovereign Lady, the Queen's Majesty that now is, by one other Act and Statute there made, all such jurisdictions, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath heretofore been or may be lawfully used over the ecclesiastical state of this realm, and the order, reformation and correction of the same, is fully and absolutely, by the authority of the same Parliament, united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm; and by the same Act and Statute there is also given to the Queen's Highness, her heirs and successors, Kings and Queens of this realm, full power and authority, by letters patents under the great Seal of England, from time to time, to assign, name and authorise such person or persons as he or she shall think meet and convenient to exercise, use, occupy and execute, under her Highness, all manner of jurisdiction, privileges, pre-eminences and authorities, in any wise touching or concerning any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or jurisdiction within this realm.

"Whereupon our said sovereign Lady, the Queen's most excellent Majesty, hath by her supreme authority, at divers times sithence the beginning of her Majesty's Reign, caused divers and sundry grave and well learned men to be duly elected, made and consecrated Archbishops and Bishops of divers Archbishopricks and Bishopricks within this realm, and other Her Majesty's Dominions and Countries according to such order and form, with such ceremonies in and about their consecrations as were allowed and set forth by the said Acts, Statutes and Orders annexed to the said book of Common Prayer before mentioned. And furthermore for the avoiding of all ambiguities and questions that might be objected against the lawful confirmations, investing, and consecrations of the said Archbishops and Bishops, Her Highness, in her Letters Patent under the great Seal of England, directed to any Archbishop, Bishop, or others, for the confirming, investing, and consecrating of any person elected to the office or dignity of any Archbishop or Bishop, hath not only used such words and

sentences as were accustomed to be used by the late King Henry and King Edward, Her Majesty's Father and Brother, in their like Letters Patent, made for such causes; but also hath used and put in Her Majesty's said Letters Patent divers other general words and sentences, whereby Her Highness, by her supreme power and authority, hath dispensed with all causes or doubts of any imperfection or disability that can or may in any wise be objected against the same, as by her Majesty's said Letters Patent remaining of Record, more plainly may appear. So that to all those that will well consider of the effect and true intent of the said Laws and Statutes, and of the supreme and absolute authority of the Queen's Highness, and which she, by her Majesty's said Letters Patent, hath used and put in use in and about the making and consecrating of the said Archbishops and Bishops, it is and may be very evident, that no cause of scruple, ambiguity or doubt, can or may justly be objected against the said elections, confirmations, or consecrations, or any other material thing meet to be had or used about the same.

"Wherefore for the plain declaration of all the premises, and to the intent that the same may the better be known to every of the Queen's Majesties subjects, whereby such evil speech as heretofore hath been used against the high state of Prelacy may hereafter cease, Be it now declared and enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, That the said Act and Statute made in the first year of the reign of our said Sovereign Lady the Queen's Majesty, whereby the said Book of Common Prayer and the Administration of Sacraments, with other Rites and Ceremonies is authorized and allowed to be used, shall stand and remain good and perfect to all respects and purposes; And that such order and form for the consecrating of Archbishops and Bishops, and for the making of Priests, Deacons, and Ministers, as was set forth in the time of the said late King Edward VI. and added to the said Book of Common Prayer, and authorized by Parliament in the fifth and sixth years of the said late King, shall stand and be in full force and effect, and shall from henceforth be used and observed in all places within this realm, and other the Queen's Majesties dominions and countries.

"And that all acts and things heretofore had, made or done by any person or persons, in or about any Consecration, Confirmation, or investing of any person or persons elected to the office or dig-

nity of any Archbishop or Bishop within this realm, or within any other the Queen's Majesties dominions or countries, by virtue of the Queen's Majesties Letters Patents or Commission sithence the beginning of her Majesties reign, be and shall be by authority of this present Parliament, declared, judged, and deemed at and from every of the several times of the doing thereof, good and perfect to all respects and purposes; any matter or thing that can, or may be objected to the contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.

"And that all persons that have been, or shall be made, ordered or consecrated Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers of God's holy Word and Sacraments, or Deacons after the form and order prescribed in the said order and form how Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Ministers should be consecrated, made and ordered, be in very deed, and also by authority hereof, declared and enacted to be, and shall be Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Ministers and Deacons, and rightly made, ordered and consecrated; any statute, law, canon or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding."

"It plainly appears by this statute," says Courayer, "that it was not the Parliament that gave validity to the ordinations, but supposed them valid, and acknowledged them as such, and consequently declares them such:" and if so, may I not ask, why suppose, as the sole or principal ground of Bonner's plea, a mere legal difficulty, which, it appears, did not exist? And yet this famous act failed in its intended effect of silencing the "overmuch boldness of speech," and "the divers questions" which it commemorates in its preamble; and during the whole of Elizabeth's reign, as well as ever since, the Anglican hierarchy was reproached with the equivocal character of its origin.

But it is said, the act of 8th Elizabeth declared valid the consecrations made according to Edward's ordinal: hence it did not heal any defect arising from the want of consecration, but solely removed whatever doubts were entertained as to the legality of such ordinal. The act in question did not, indeed, profess to supply the want of consecration in express terms, but it did so indirectly, and in a manner calculated to silence all objections to any thing theretofore done in the matter. Mr. Russell describes the act as if it solely provided for the validity of the consecrations which had been theretofore or should thereafter be made *according*

to Edward's ordinal. This is not a full statement of its objects, as the reader may see by reference to the penultimate clause of the act itself, beginning with these words: "And that all acts and things heretofore had, made, or done, etc."

Mr. Russell's reasoning on the act of 8th Elizabeth, as if it necessarily required those whom it declared to be bishops, archbishops, &c., to have been ordained according to Edward's ordinal, is, consequently, erroneous. This act was a complete legal remedy for any defect in the consecrations it recognized.

In his history of the Westminster Assembly, Hetherington (Presbyterian) says: "An act was passed ratifying the thirty-nine articles which had been framed by the Convocation of 1562; and one clause in that act admitted the validity of ordination by presbyters alone without a bishop. This clause was greatly disliked by the bishops, and has been repeatedly condemned by their successors, but remains still unrepealed." The act referred to is 13 Eliz. c. 12, by which it was enacted, "That every person under the degree of a bishop which doth or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's holy word and sacraments, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration or ordering, than the form set forth by Parliament in the time of the late king, of most worthy King Edward the Sixth, or now used in the reign of our most gracious sovereign lady, should declare his adhesion to the doctrine of the English Church before the bishop of the diocese in which he was, also within a given time before the congregation which he served."*

I now pass to the examination of the sentiments of the English Catholic divines of the time of Queen Elizabeth, who were the contemporaries of those whose consecration is contested, and many of whom had, for a time, professed the new religion.

Before entering on this portion of my inquiry, I must claim the indulgence of the reader while I vindicate the character of the witnesses about to be produced, from the aspersions cast upon

* "The statute, 13 Eliz., c. 12, recognizes foreign ordinations, on condition of subscribing the doctrinal articles among the thirty-nine. Whittingham, with foreign, i. e., Presbyterian orders, died Dean of Durham, and Travers was a preacher at the temple."—Notes on the Nature and Extent of the Royal Supremacy in the Anglican Church, by David Lewis, M. A., London, 1847. Mr. Evans adduces a passage from a letter of Archbishop Sandys to Lord Burleigh, in which he calls on Whittingham to show the authority of his ministry. It reminds one of Luther, asking the Anabaptists to prove their mission by miracles; or the Gracchi, complaining of sedition.

them by the advocates of Anglican orders, chiefly with the view of discrediting their testimony. Mr. Evans calls them the "opprobrium of the Roman obedience." Whether they or their Anglican contemporaries could be justly styled the "opprobrium" of the party to which they were attached, a few observations will show.

The Catholic doctors, Harding, Stapleton, Sanders, Bristow, Champney, Kellison, Holliwood, were men who, not choosing to conform to the changes of religion in the time of Queen Elizabeth, preferred voluntary exile, and all the privations and sufferings with which it is accompanied, to a residence in their native country, and the enjoyment of the honours and emoluments which then rewarded religious apostacy. On the other hand, Parker, and his fellow bishops, were the most obsequious ministers of the royal will, submitting to the dictation of the queen in matters of faith and discipline,* conforming to her views and desires for the establishment of an hierarchy, notwithstanding their strong presbyterian predilections;† persecuting, at the least intimation of the tyrant's will, those deluded religionists with whose errors they sympathized, and securing for themselves, as the reward of their multifarious servility, the honours and emoluments of an hierarchy

* Jewel, writing to Bullinger, over date of 8th February, 1566, says—Atque utinam omnia etiam tenuissima vestigia Papatus, ex templis et multo maxime ex animis auferri potuissent. Sed Regina ferre mutationem in religione hoc tempore nullam potest.—Apud Strype, App. 88, t. 11. ("And would to God that all, even the very least vestiges of Popery, might vanish from the temples, and still more from the heart. But the queen can bear no change in religion at this time.") Elizabeth knew well how to manage *her* bishops. The following is one of many instances:—"May 7, 1577. The queen commands the bishops to suppress certain religious exercises in their dioceses, threatening them, 'if we shall hear of any person attempting to offend in the premises, without your correction or information to us, we be not found to make some example or reformation of you according to your deserts' (Wilkins, IV., 289.); which took place in her suspension of Archbishop Grindall, from the exercise of her jurisdiction."—Lewis. This was perfectly conformable to the principles which had given rise to the Anglican church. An Act of 34 Henry VIII., contained the following clause—"Nothing shall be maintained contrary to the king's instructions. And if any spiritual person preach, teach, or maintain any thing contrary to the king's instructions or determinations, made or to be made, and shall be thereof convicted, he shall, for his first offence, recant; for the second, abjure and bear a fagot; and for the third shall be adjudged a heretic, and be burned, and lose all his goods and chattels."

† The leading men of the first race of Puritans were, Bishops Jewel, Grindall, Horn, Sandys, Pilkington, Parkhurst, and Guest; also, Miles Coverdale, Fox, Dr. Humphreys, Mr. Sampson, and many others of scarcely inferior reputation. Even Parker, at first, opposed the episcopal vestments, and was consecrated without them.—*History of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, by the Rev. W. M. Hetherington*, New York, 1844, p. 29, note.

that had sacrificed every thing to principle. Were the question in dispute to be decided by the relative merits of the prominent men of the two parties, none would hesitate to prefer the sincerity of the exile to the servility of the court sycophant.

HARDING.

Between the years 1562 and 1568, a distinguished Catholic divine, Dr. Harding, carried on a controversy with Dr. Jewel, Protestant Bishop of Salisbury. Heylin thus sketches the character of these two celebrated men:—"The combatants, (Jewel and Harding,) were born in the same country, bred up in the same grammar school, and studied in the same university also: So that it may be said of them, as the historian hath of Jugurtha and Sylla, under Caius Marius, that is to say, they both learned those feats of arms in the same camp, and under the same commander, which afterwards they were to exercise against one another. Both zealous Protestants also in the time of King Edward, and both relapsed to Popery in the time of Queen Mary; Jewel for fear, and Harding upon hope of favour and preferment by it. But Jewel's fall may be compared to that of St. Peter's, which was short and sudden, rising again by his repentance, and fortified more strongly in his faith than before he was. But Harding's, like to that of the other Simon, premeditated and resolved on, never to be restored again, (so much was there within him of the gall of bitterness,) to his former standing."

The account of this controversy, given in the first edition of this work, has been declared unfaithful by Mr. Russell, who has made me the subject of some not very complimentary observations on the occasion. To avoid all possible misunderstanding, I have translated from Champney the relation which I professed to have abridged in my former work. In a special note, at the end of this chapter, I have given the statement as published in the former edition of this work, and have endeavoured to sustain its accuracy. Champney thus relates the controversy:*

"The seventh and last argument by which it can be shown that the Anglican bishops have no true and valid consecration is this. Jewel, one of those who, in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign,

* Champney; De vocatione ministrorum, c. xiii., p. 457.

were intruded into the episcopal sees, and consecrated by a new form of ordination, being one of the most willing, and at the same time of the best able to defend his own and his companions' ordination, did not dare to deny its insufficiency, and its essential defects; but by dissembling, and passing over in silence, the strong arguments of his opponent on this subject, must be judged by every intelligent person to have admitted them. And, therefore, it is more than probable, that they were not truly and validly ordained. That the force of this argument may be clear to all, it is necessary to state Harding's controversy with Jewel on this subject.

"Harding thus urges him: 'To leave your succession, which you cannot prove, and to come to the discussion of your vocation, (ordination), pray, tell me, whereas you bear yourself as Bishop of Salisbury, how can you prove your ordination? By what authority have you taken on you the ministry of the Word and of the Sacraments? What proof of your ministry can you bring? Who imposed hands on you? On what precedent was that done? How and by whom were you consecrated? Who sent you? Who committed to you the office which you exercise? Are you a priest or not? If not, how can you be so bold as to take on you the name and office of a bishop? If you are a priest, tell me who ordained you? No one has hitherto been regarded as a priest, unless he is found *to have been ordained by a Bishop? And Bishops also have, from the times of the Apostles, always been consecrated by three other Bishops*, with the consent of the Metropolitan, and the confirmation of the Roman Pontiff, agreeably to the canons of the Church. Thus unity has, hitherto, been preserved; thus schisms are cut off. And this is what St. Cyprian calls legitimate ordination; the want of which made him deny that Novatian was bishop, or had any power in the Church. To this, neither you, nor your companions, who have usurped the administration of the sacraments, can answer any thing with truth, I am well aware.

"'Do you not remember, what judgment St. Athanasius, and the Bishops of Egypt, Thebais, Lybia, and Pentapolis formerly passed on Ischyras the Arian? And why, I pray you, may not all Catholics pass the same judgment on you? Again, what will you say of St. Epiphanius, who sharply rebuked one Zaccheus of his time, because, although not a priest, he dared, with wicked temerity, to touch the sacred mysteries and discharge the priestly

office!' To these powerful and vehement questionings, let us hear what solid and direct answer Jewel gave.

"JEWEL.—'Whereas, it further pleaseth you to call for my letters of orders, and to demand of me, as by some authority, whether I be a priest or no? What hands were laid over me, and by what order I was made? I answer you: I am a priest made long sithence (since) by the same order and ordinance, and I think also by the same man and the same hands that you, Mr. Harding, were made priest by, in the late time of that most virtuous prince, King Edward the Sixth. Therefore you cannot well doubt of my priesthood, without like doubting of your own.'

"Harding thus replies to this answer of Jewel: 'Neither by the same ordinance, nor by the same man, nor by the same hands, nor in the time of the aforesaid King. But you have not answered half my questions: for I laid down this ground out of St. Jerom: 'That is not a Church which has not a priest;' and he there describes such a priest, who has power to consecrate the sacrament of the altar, that is, who can offer an external sacrifice, and he depicts such a bishop as possesses the faculty of ordaining priests. For the word 'priest' as you know signifies 'bishop' also. St. Jerom was there disputing against Hilarius the deacon, who, when he was alone in his own sect, and could neither offer sacrifice, nor ordain priests, was obliged to leave his congregation without a priest. Therefore, I inquire as well concerning your *episcopal as sacerdotal ordination.* Permit me, therefore, to recall my words once more to your mind. Thus I wrote, and *you have not yet answered:* 'To leave your succession which you cannot prove, and to come to the discussion of your vocation,' &c., just as we already cited it from his first book, that is from his 'Confutation of the Apology of the Church of England.' And in fine, he further adds, in the passage cited from this second book:

"'When I asked this of you, Jewel, you neither say on what precedent hands were imposed on you, nor who sent you, but this only you mention, that he who ordained me in the time of King Edward made you a priest. But I was not made priest in the time of King Edward; and hence if you are not more a priest than I was then, you are yet a deacon, nor have you received any order according to the Catholic rite, but only in schism. For, indeed, when I closely examined the questions which *in my Confutation* I proposed to you, I felt that I was not only not priest,

but not even a lawful deacon, by that ordination which was conferred in the time of King Edward, as I am persuaded that those who then presumed to ordain others, were themselves wholly without orders; conferring orders not according to the rite of the Catholic Church, because putting aside the succession of all bishops in the Christian world, they erected a new congregation of their own planting, whose form was the product of their own brain, and had never before been seen or practised.'

"These and many other answers being given to the empty and most frivolous answer of Jewel, what answer did this last at length make? A profound silence, for he so dissembles this whole refutation, as if it never had been published; although he, Jewel, published a third book, in which he pretends to answer whatever Harding had objected to him in that book in which these things are read. But that most crafty man knew that these questions could not receive a satisfactory answer, and, therefore, as well in his second as in his third book, he thought much safer for him to dissemble them, than to adduce them and not refute them. Moreover, he expected that few would read the books of his adversary, (which, under the false pretext of sedition, he had caused to be publicly prohibited) and thus that his fraud would become known but to few. But let us see, if he fully satisfies all the other questions of his opponent.

JEWEL.—"Further, as if you were my metropolitan ye demand of me, whether I be a bishop or no? I answer you: I am a bishop, and that by the free and accustomed canonical election of the whole chapter of Sarisbury, (Salisbury,) assembled solemnly together for that purpose. Of which companie, you, M. Harding were then one, and as I was informed being present there in your own person, amongst your brethren, gave free and open consent unto the election. If you denie this, take heed your owne breath blow not against you." HARDING.—'Your election, Jewel, was not free; because the chapter that chose you, knew full well, that unless they elected you, they would incur the penalty of the laws and the anger of the prince. Your election was not canonical, since one was elected whom the ancient canons show to have been unworthy of the dignity and office.' And after some observations, by which he shows that the election of Jewel was against the ancient canons.

"'You say, however, that you are bishop by canonical election,

but if the canons were observed, those who elected you, ought to lose the right of suffrage, and otherwise be punished, because they were so guilty as to elect a prelate for themselves, whom they knew to be, on many heads, condemned by the canons. Was there ever any one more shameless than you, Jewel? What will you not say, when I am dead, since you do not blush to impute to me, while I am living, what I neither did, nor ever thought of doing? I acknowledge that I belonged to the chapter at that time, being a prebendary and the treasurer of that church, as I am yet so by right: but I was not of the number of those who consented to your election. You say, moreover, that you have been informed, that, being then and there present, I freely and openly gave my vote to your election. But here, as well as in other places, you deceive the reader by a palpable falsehood: for you knew the contrary. In fine, I was not there, nor was the matter intimated to me when your pretended election took place.

"'And if my denial does not merit to prevail over your affirmation, let the registers be examined; for although you are a notorious fabricator, you cannot easily corrupt them, (here Harding appeals to several members of the chapter by name.)—Indeed we would have esteemed it equally criminal to elect you Bishop of Salisbury, as to have elected Arius, Eunomius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Aerius, Pelagius, or any other condemed heretic. Recall, then, these numerous falsehoods which you have uttered at one breath. Your election was not free; it was not canonical; the whole chapter was not present; I was not present, neither did I consent. Since then you have asserted these things so shamelessly, take heed, that to use your own words, your own breath blow not against you.'

"Jewel answered nothing to all these charges, but buried them in profound silence. Being evidently convicted of so many and such great falsehoods, the cunning man preferred to pass them by in silence, rather than by stirring such a sink to spread abroad a bad odour. But he answers the other questions of Harding.

JEWEL.—"'As for the impertinent tales of Ischyras and Zacchaeus, they touch us nothing. They were none of ours, we know them not. Our bishops are made in form and order, as they have been ever by free election of the chapter: by consecration of the archbishop and other three bishops, and by the admission of the prince.'

HARDING.—"'These true histories, not tales, concern you and

yours, inasmuch as they indicate, that priests are not so made among you, that standing at the altar they can offer sacrifice, which Ischyras is said to have attempted. And of Zacchaeus, St. Epiphanius writes, 'that jestingly he handled the sacred mysteries, and, although a laic, impudently meddled with sacrifice.' What sacrifice, I ask you, has your religion, which a layman as well as a priest might not offer? But because you have cast away all external sacrifice and priesthood, therefore you think that the example of Zacchaeus does not touch you. These examples show that you and your companions are not bishops, and hence they are not irrelevant.'

"'You say that your bishops were made by the consecration of the archbishop and of three other bishops. But your archbishop, himself, how was he consecrated? And what three bishops were in the whole kingdom, who imposed hands on them? You have *now* brought forward what makes the matter worse against yourself, than hitherto it was objected by me. For your archbishop, who ought by his authority to confirm the consecration of all of you, had not a lawful consecration. There were, indeed, lawful bishops, who either were not required to impose hands on you, or, being required, refused to do so: which clearly shows that you sought not for such a consecration which had always been in use, but a new one of which all the former bishops were ashamed.'

"To this most pungent reply, by which it is so expressly objected, that the new bishops of England, and especially (*nominatim*) the Metropolitan himself, on whose lawful consecration that of the others depends, were not consecrated, Jewel answered not a word, being overwhelmed with the truth of the charge.—For that he was not consecrated at all, or that that was done at the Nag's Head, as we shall further on show, or in fine, in some other way which, Jewel, lest he should expose himself to the attack of his most watchful adversary, dared not say, most clearly appears from his obstinate dissembling of what had been objected to him.

"What authority or confidence, then, can be inspired by these acts, records or registers, of which Mason boasts so much, in which he insists that the time, the place, and the ministers of the consecration of all these, (bishops) are recorded, let the prudent reader judge. Certainly all these things must have been either unknown to Jewel, although his name appears written on the record, in his own hand, or they appeared to be so little, or rather of no value

in the defence of their consecration, that he would not adduce them in defence of his own and of his colleagues' consecration."*

In addition to the foregoing extracts, the following one from the same author's confutation of the apology of Bishop Jewel, shows that he did not recognize the fact of ordination by a bishop, in the first prelates of the Anglican Church; "For, whereas, after the doctrine of your newe Gospel, like the forerunners of Antichrist, ye have abandoned the external sacrifice and priesthood of the New Testament, and have not in your sect consecrated bishops, and therefore being without priestes made with lawfull laying on of hands, as Scripture requireth, all holy *orders being given by bishops only.*"

He elsewhere in that same 'Confutation,' says that these ministers have not been made by lawfully consecrated bishops, but have been placed in the ministry either by the people, or the civil power—"or by monks and friars apostates, or by excommunicated priestes, having not bishoply power."

STAPLETON.

The next witness I shall produce to establish the proposition which forms the title of this chapter, is Thomas Stapleton, an eminent Catholic divine, and, like Harding, an exile for conscience' sake. Bramhall says of him: "We look upon Dr. Stapleton as one of the most rational heads that your Church hath had from the separation."† He had a controversy with Horn, Bishop of Winchester, at different periods between 1565 and 1573. In his answer to Horn, he says, referring to the result of the proceedings against Bonner, that, "while they were endeavouring to force on him (Bonner) the oath of supremacy, they were found to be MOCK BISHOPS—EPISCOPI LARVATI;"‡ an expression that, surely, must have been suggested by some more real defect in their consecration than the non-revival by name of an ordinal actually revived. In another work, he says, "To say the truth, you are no Lord of Winchester, nor elsewhere, but only Mr. Robert Horn. Is it not notorious that you and your colleagues were not ordained

* Champnæus De Vocat Minist., c. cxiii., p. 457, ed. 1616.

† Bramhall, c. 7, apud Le Quien.

‡ "Nam dum eum exagitarent et ad suscipiendum juramentum fidelitatis omnibus modis importune urgerent ipsi episcopi larvati deprehensi sunt."—Answer to Horn, c. 5.

according to the prescript, I will not say of the Church, but even of the very statutes? How, then, can you challenge for yourself the name of the Lord Bishop of Winchester, of which both civil and ecclesiastical law deprives you?"*

Much stress is laid, by the defenders of Anglican orders, on these words of Stapleton, "but even of the very statutes," as if the want of legal consecration was Stapleton's principal motive for denying Horn's episcopal character. These words, however, occurring as they do in an *à fortiori* argument, show that Stapleton had other and weightier grounds of objection than that supplied by legal informality, since he urges it as the least of his objections. Horn is, indeed, reproached with not being a bishop, according to the requirements of the law; because the law required consecration, and this Stapleton denies Horn to have received.† Mr. Evans, after Dr. Elrington, adduces a passage from the preface to Stapleton's "Counterblast," in which the revival of Edward's ordinal is denied, and the legal defect, from the circumstance of its non-revival, principally dwelt upon. That Stapleton, however, had other objections, more worthy of the theologian, will soon be made manifest. Besides, all admit that, whatever legal defect was in the consecration of the first Anglican bishops, it had been removed by the act of 1566. After this time, and it was after this time that the controversy between Stapleton and Horn took place, it could not be said that before the law, and according to the prescript of the statutes, Horn was not the real Bishop of Winchester, if, indeed, he had been consecrated according to the ordinal of Edward VI.

In the same work Stapleton also says to Horn: "You are without any consecration of your metropolitan (Parker), himself, poor man, being no bishop neither."‡ Stapleton also replied to Jewel, to whom he says: "How chanced then, Mr. Jewel, that you and your fellows, bearing yourselves for bishops, have not so much as this congruity and consent, I will not say of the Pope, but of

* Quis nescit te tuosque collegas, non dico aliter quam requirunt canones, sed ne secundum præscriptum statutorum vestrorum ordinatos esse. Qua ergo fronte, qua facie nomen Domini Episcopi Wintoniensis tibi arrogare audes, quo leges tam municipales quam ecclesiasticæ te privant?—Counterblast to Horn, pretended Bishop of Winchester, p. 301. Had Horn been consecrated according to Edward's ordinal, how could Stapleton have denied that the civil laws recognized his consecration?

† Propugnaculum fidei primitivæ Anglorum, par. 2, c. 8.

‡ Counterblast to Horn, p. 301.

any Christian bishops at all throughout all Christendom; neither are you liked and allowed by any one of them all, but have taken upon you that office WITHOUT ANY IMPOSITION OF HANDS, without all ecclesiastical authority, without all order of canons and right. I ask not who gave you bishoprics, BUT WHO MADE YOU BISHOPS."*

Here let the reader observe how accurately Stapleton, one of the most exact Catholic writers on the Protestant controversy, distinguishes the various defects in Horn's episcopal character. The prelates of the Anglican Church had no communion with the Bishop of Rome, nor with the bishops of the Christian world; nor had they been consecrated by "any imposition of hands,"—SINE ULLA MANUUM IMPOSITIONE. This would not have been true if Parker's consecration at Lambeth is to be admitted. This defect is urged as a distinct objection, and, as it is but natural to expect it should have been, as the greatest of all the difficulties advanced by him. In another place he says to Horn: "For although he might style you Bishop of Winchester, yet I am in the right to declare that you are neither a bishop nor the Bishop of Winchester."†

In his homily on the festival of St. Peter and Paul, Stapleton says: "No one is lawfully sent, unless he be sent by the bishop through the imposition of hands. The heretics of our time want this mission, for they are sent by no bishops. Although with the Lutherans and Calvinists some are sent by the imposition of hands, still, because the first teachers were not sent by any one, all this imaginary mission is a 'mere farce' (*merum nugamentum*).—Such are all who in England are called bishops, who, when the real bishops were ejected, with one exception, by the queen's power,—succeeding no one, but beginning from themselves, they *received from no one the imposition of hands*, not even from the Germans or the French, or the pastors of any of these so called Reformed Churches."‡

Here is a most explicit denial that the Anglican prelates had received any imposition of hands, not even from the foreign reformers, French or German. Stapleton objects something more than the mutilated ritual of Edward, or the supposed legal defect of its non-revival. In his "Controversies," he says of the English bishops, "that whereas they, at first, seized on the epis-

* Challenge to Jewel and Horn, touching their consecration.
† Apud Courayer, p. 121. ‡ Tom. 4, p. 851.

copal sees, solely by the royal power, *sola regia authoritate*—they now absurdly (*ridicule*) ordain their ministers by the imposition of hands."* Let the reader say, whether Stapleton could have thus written, had Parker been consecrated by any one having even a colourable title to the episcopal character. Again he says:

"If I ask further by what right does he take to himself the title of Bishop of Winchester, when he has been raised to this station merely by the letters patent of his queen, without consecration, or the imposition of hands *of any bishop or bishops whatsoever*, (which imposition of hands St. Paul used in consecrating Timothy, and the universal church has used as a fit means of ordaining a bishop,) neither he nor his companions, even yet remaining unordained prelates, if they would speak for themselves, as Catholic Christians, never will be able to answer, nor to assign a reason why they should be held as true bishops and not rather remain in the rank of mere laymen, or simple priests, as they were before."† Elsewhere: "I say, therefore, that these intruders are not bishops, if we are to judge according to the sacred Scripture and the practice of the primitive church. Of the civil laws of England I do not speak; for it was lately proved that they were not bishops according to them."‡ "But the Protestants reject this sacrament and deny all such grace, and occupy the episcopal sees *without any imposition of the hands* of the priesthood. These bishops, invading episcopal sees without any legitimate vocation, and *having no imposition of the hands of* the priesthood, what authority do they merit."§

* Anglo-Calvinistæ, cum sola auctoritate regia cathedras episcopales occuparent, nunc per manuum impositionem suos ministros ridicule ordinant, allatrantibus Puritanis, et totam illam ceremoniam deridentibus, atque seniorum consistoria per quos ordinationes fiant efflagitantibus.—Quæst. 4, art. 4. Mr. Haddan states that this work was published first in 1596.—Apud Evans.

† Si quærerem amplius quo jure nomen episcopi Wintoniensis, (ut in libro suo facit,) sibi vindicet, cum tantum Litteris Patentibus suæ Principis ad hanc vocationem vocatus sit, sine consecratione aut impositione manuum cujuscunque episcopi, aut episcoporum (qua impositione manuum S. Paulus usus est ad Timotheum consecrandum, et universalis Ecclesia illa tan quam proprio medio ad episcopum ecclesiæ ordinandum usa est,) neque ille neque sui socii, inordinati etiamnum existentes prælati, (modo ut Christiani Catholici loqui velint,) pro se nunquam respondere poterunt, neque rationem reddere, cur veri episcopi haberi debeant, sed potius *meri laici*, vel simplices Presbyteri, ut ante fuerant, maneant.—Stapleton, t. 2, p. 1144.

‡ Dico igitur hos intrusos, si juxta Sacram Scripturam et Ecclesiæ primitivæ praxim judicemus, episcopos non esse. De legibus Angliæ municipalibus non loquor, nuper probatum fuit eos juxta illas episcopos non esse.

§ Protestantes autem hoc sacramentum rejiciunt, et omnem talem gratiam negant et episcopales sedes occupant sine omni impositione manuum Presbiterii. Illi

SANDERS.

The change of religion under Elizabeth, found Nicholas Sanders Regius Professor of Canon Law in the University of Oxford. Unwilling to sacrifice his conscience to his worldly interests, he retired to Rome, where he was raised to the priesthood. He accompanied Cardinal Hosius as theologian to the Council of Trent, and was subsequently made professor of theology in Louvain. He died in 1583. He was the author of several theological works, as also of a History of the English Schism, which yet continues to be deservedly esteemed. In this, speaking of the first English bishops, he says: "When these overseers (bishops) were to be created, they were not able to persuade the Catholic bishops to impose hands on them, and not having among themselves three or two bishops or any metropolitan ordained by other bishops of their party, who might consecrate them, or consent to their consecration, neither had they recourse to the neighbouring Lutheran or Calvinist churches to obtain thence the aid of bishops (who perhaps were not there.) They were very urgent with an Irish archbishop, who was then confined in prison; and offered him liberty and recompense, if he would impose hands on them. But the good man would not consent to impose hands on heretics, or be implicated in their guilt. Being thus destitute of all lawful ordination, and by the very laws of England proved not to be bishops, they were obliged to implore the civil power, that they might obtain the sanction of the lay magistrate, in a subsequent parliament. By the authority of which, whatever had been done irregularly or unlawfully, or whatever had been omitted in their inauguration, was remitted them; and this after they had discharged the episcopal office and occupied sees some years, *without any consecration.* Hence they obtained the name of *Parliamentary bishops.*"*

superintendentes sine aliqua legitima vocatione sedes episcopales invadentes, nec ullam impositionem manuum Presbyterii habentes, quam auctoritatem merentur?

* Sed cum isti superintendentes creandi essent, nec a Catholicis episcopis impetrare potuerint ut ipsis manus admoverent, nec inter se aut tres, aut duos episcopos, nec ullum prorsus perfidiæ suæ Metropolitanum ab aliis episcopis ordinatum haberent, cujus vel manu vel consensu consecrari possent; nec etiam ad vicinas Lutheranorum aut Calvinistarum ecclesias se contulerunt ut inde mutuas episcoporum, (qui forte nec ibi erant,) operas peterent. Instabant quidem multum apud quem dam archiepiscopum Hibernum quem tune in carcere Londinensi in vinculis habebant, ut illis in hac necessitate succurreret, ipsi libertate et præmiis propositis, si vellet istorum ordinationi præsse; sed vir bonus nullo modo adduci potuit ut hæ-

Mr. Evans says, that Sanders objects nothing more than a mere legal defect in the Anglican orders. That he objects a legal defect, is certain; but that he objects a merely legal defect is refuted, as well by the general tenor of his narrative, as by his declaration, that the Anglican bishops had "enjoyed the episcopal chair and office, *for some years*, WITHOUT ANY CONSECRATION." No theologian would have urged a merely legal defect as destructive of the episcopal character. Besides, as before observed, had such merely legal defect been objected before the act of 1566, it could not have been objected afterwards, the Parliament having remedied all that might have been wrong in what was done before that time. This was consequently before the law, as if no such defect had ever existed. Previous to the passing of that act, civilians might have objected the alleged informality; but after that act, no such objection would lie. Neither before, nor after the passing of that act, could Catholic theologians have objected a legal informality, as destructive of the validity of the ordination, which was not at the same time a radical defect. This was precisely the case. Both the laws of England, and the canon law required the imposition of hands, as essential for the episcopal character; and the consecration of the Anglican bishops was illegal, because, as Sanders states, they were for "some years, without ANY CONSECRATION." Hence he styles them "Reginales Praelati," or "Queen's prelates;" and he thus dedicated one of his works to Parker: "Master Dr. Parker, bearing the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury."*

BRISTOW.

Bristow, another distinguished Catholic divine, who died in 1582, says: "We have many examples in England, as Parker's, Grindal's, Sandes', Horn's and others, who having been formerly ordained priests, according to the Catholic rite, were regarded,

reticis sacras manus imponeret, vel alieno peccato communicaret. Ita omni legitima ordinatione destituti, cum vulgo dicerentur, et ipsis legibus Anglicanis vere probarentur non esse episcopi, brachium sæculare invocare coacti sunt, ut laicalis magistratus confirmationem in futuris comitiis acciperent. Quorum auctoritate, si quid minus rite et legaliter in priori inauguratione gestum esset aut omissum ipsis condonaretur idque post quam episcopali officio et Cathedra *absque ulla consecratione*, aliquot annos functi essent. Hinc nomen illis impositum ut *episcopi Parliamentarii* dicerentur.—Sanders' Hist. Schism., lit. 3, 166.

* Sanders, lib. 3, p. 297.

without any new ordination, not only as priests, but as bishops, archbishops and primates, either by virtue of the royal letters alone, or by a certain ridiculous consecration of those who had received no power to consecrate but from the queen."* Again: "Not only did Luther, who never was a bishop, create Amsdorf a bishop, but even in England, the king, and even the queen give diplomas to those whom they will, and these afterwards act as bishops and ordain ministers, manifestly destroying the institution of Christ, which, commencing from the apostles, has ever been observed in the Church."† And again: "Consider," says he, "what church that is whose ministers are but very laymen, unsent, uncalled, unconsecrated, holding therefore among us, when they repent and return, no other place but of laymen; in no case admitted, nor looking to minister any office, unless they take orders, which before they had not."

Mr. Evans objects to the first of these assertions, that it is unworthy of credit, because opposed to the notorious fact, that the Church of England requires ordination; as evinced by the ordinal, the prayer book, and the homilies of that church. Bristow, however, does not deny that ordination is required in the Anglican Church, his words have reference to the origin of the hierarchy in that communion. The authenticity of the last passage is called in question by Mr. Evans, who says, it first appeared in the Latin edition of a work founded on Bristow's, and published by Worthington, in 1608. Not having any means of ascertaining the accuracy of this statement, it is sufficient for me to say, that the work published in 1608 professes to be a translation of the original work, made by Bristow himself; as was not uncommonly the case in those times; and, therefore, in the

* Exempla habemus in Anglia quamplurima, ut Parkeri, Grindalli, Sandesii, Hornii, et aliorum qui secundum Catholicum ritum olim Presbyteri ordinati, idonei visi sunt, qui sine ordinatione nova, non solum presbyteri essent sed et episcopi et archiepiscopi, et Primates essent, vel solis literis regiis vel ridicula quadam consecratione eorum qui nullam nisi a Regina potestatem consecrandi acceperant.—Antihæret Motiva, t. 2, p. 264. Bristow's work was first published in English, in 1567; afterwards in English, in 1599, seventeen years after the author's death; subsequently at Arras, in 1608, in Latin.

† A Protestantibus autem, quia viderunt se episcopos non habere, necessario hoc mutuatum fuit, ita ut non solum Lutherus qui nunquam episcopus fait, Amsdorfium quasi episcopum creaverit, sed etiam in Anglia, rex, imo et regina dat diplomata quibus velit, et hi deinceps gerunt se pro episcopis, manifestissime rescindentes institutionem Christi quæ ab Apostolis inchoata, semper deinceps in Ecclesia ejus servatur, et ministros inciperent ordinare.

absence of a single motive to adopt a contrary opinion, must be regarded as such. Dr. Worthington, the editor, was president of Douay Seminary, and a character every way respectable. Besides, Mr. Haddan quotes from the orginal work, published in 1574, the following passage, which shows that there is no improbability in supposing, that the sentence above quoted proceeded from Bristow's pen. He says: "The English seek as much as they possibly can to be consecrated by one of our order, lest there might some danger or doubt arise afterwards of their right institution."* And he denies "that they can show the lawful, orderly, entire, without any breach, and sound notorious succession of bishops, &c., ever since the apostles' times."† "The man who affirmed this," adds Mr. Haddan, "*and no more*, had certainly never heard of the Nag's Head story." I shall only say, that the man who affirmed this, as Bristow did in 1574, could not have believed that the first Protestant bishops had received consecration—no matter of what rite—from a bishop who himself had been consecrated. Wherefore this anxiety, which is not confined to the early youth of Anglicanism, to receive consecration at the hands of a Catholic bishop? No other motive can be suggested, than a profound conviction that a validly consecrated bishop had not elevated the secular character of its origin, by impressing on it the seal of apostolic ministry.

RAINOLDS, WESTON, OSORIUS.

William Rainolds having professed the Anglican creed, and been, for a time, a minister of that church, embraced the Catholic faith. Among several works he wrote in defence of the ancient church, is one *Calvino Turcismo*, printed at Antwerp in 1596, two years after his death. In it he says:

"There is no herdsman in all Turkey who hath not undertaken the government of his herd upon better reason and greater right, order, and authority than these your magnificent apostles and evangelists can show for this divine and high office of governing souls."‡ Weston says of the same supposed prelates that they were made such,—*non ritu aliquo sacro, aut episcopali actione*,—by no sacred rite or episcopal act.§ So notorious, indeed, appears to

* Motives to the Catholic Faith, 1574, p. 90, apud Evans.
† Id., § 22, fol. 93 a, 94 b.
‡ Calvino-Turcismo, lib. 4, c. 15, p. 975. § Apud Hardouin, t. 1, p. 86.

have been the fact, that the first Protestant bishops were not consecrated, that Osorius, a celebrated bishop in Portugal, urged the objection in the life-time of Parker. An unexceptionable witness says: "Hieronymus Osorius, who, although a mere Portuguese magpie, imagines himself to be a harmonious nightingale, while he utters malicious and mischievous sounds against our sacraments, against our Church and prelates, asserts that our bishops were men taken from the highways and taverns, not distinguished for chaste lives, sacred learning or eloquence, and unworthily invested with that dignity; that they are mere disciples of a Bucer or Martyr, and have been instructed by Calvin; that *they were consecrated without ceremony.*"*

Mr. Evans remarks that the extracts from Weston and Osorius are suspiciously short; and conjectures, that were access had to their works, some modifying expression would be found in connection with those which I have adduced. Surely such modifying expressions would have been produced before this by the defenders of Anglican orders, if such existed. Although a Portuguese, Osorius, contrary to Mr. Evans' assertion, may have known something of the matter. He is an unexceptionable witness of the opinion entertained by the Catholic theologians of his time, that the first Anglican bishops had been "consecrated without any ceremony"—*sine ulla cæremonia consecrati.* Whether Rainolds were mad or not, as Mr. Evans, following some earlier writer, insinuates, the opinion he expresses of the Anglican orders is perfectly consistent with the sentiments of the soundest heads and most respectable men of the time in which he lived.

In the supplication addressed by the Catholic priests to James I., in 1604, they expressly state; "Neither is any of your Protestant ministers coming to our Catholic fraternity, reputed other than merely laymen without orders."†

I shall conclude this part of the evidence in the words of the great advocate of the Anglican ordinations, Courayer, who says: "I know that Stapleton, Harding, and other Catholic writers contemporary with Parker, have affirmed to the face of the new bishops, that they were not true bishops, that their consecration was a chimera, and that they could not prove their ordination;

* Dr. Humphreys' *Epistola Nuncupatoria*, to Mathew Parker and Sandes, prefixed to his life of Jewel, &c. London, 1573.

† Mason.

having received it from a man, whose ordination was equally unsustainable."*

The foregoing denials of Catholic writers, that the Anglican bishops had originally received consecration, are confirmed by the manner in which distinguished Anglican theologians expressed themselves on the nature and necessity of ordination.

Whitaker, a professor of Cambridge, and a very distinguished Anglican divine in the reign of Elizabeth,† uses language and arguments in reply to the Catholic objections on the subject of orders, which cannot easily be reconciled with the knowledge of Parker's consecration at Lambeth. Mr. Evans endeavours to diminish the force of the conclusion derived from his words, by calling him a "Puritan;"‡ but, in the dedication of a portion of his works to Cecil, the queen's secretary, and of others to Archbishop Whitgift, we have an evidence that he was more esteemed by the leading churchmen of his day, than would have been the case had he differed widely from his brethren in their doctrinal views. I abridge from Le Quien the argument by which, in his controversy with Durey, a Jesuit, he met the difficulty objected to him, arising from want of valid ordination. "I would not have you to imagine that men of our faith make so much account of your ordination, as to account their own vocation unlawful without them: therefore, keep your orders to yourselves." Bramhall says that Whitaker does not disapprove of orders in general, but of orders as conferred in the Roman church.§ This reply is not a faithful exposition of his doctrine, as the following extract plainly shows. "I answer, that the succession of our pastors is true, lawful, and apostolic, and, therefore, that our Church is the true Church, which always has had and yet has such pastors. What then, you will say, Is the succession of our pastors visible? *By no means; for this is not necessary.*‖" Here, as Le Quien

* Courayer, p. 255.

† John Whitaker, Master of St. John's College, Cambridge, learnedly answered all the books of Bellarmine.—Baker's Chronicle.

‡ Essays, p. 118.

§ Nolo vos existimare nostræ fidei homines tanti facere ordinationes vestras, ut suam vocationem absque eis illicitam reputent; proindeque vobismetipsis vestros habeatis ordines.—Wit. Controv. Lib. 9, p. 222; Ed. Genevæ, 1610.

‖ Respondeo nostram pastorum successionem esse veram, esse legitimam, esse Apostolicam, et proinde nostram Ecclesiam veram, Ecclesiam esse quæ tales pastores habuit semper et nunc habet. Quid ergo? Nostra pastorum successio visibiles est? Nequaquam, neque enim hoc necesse est.—Controv. 11, quaest. V., c. 16.

remarks, Whitaker makes a false statement, if Parker was consecrated by Barlow, and Barlow himself were a consecrated bishop. In that case, there would have been a visible succession, for this is the distinction which Mason, by adducing the Register, endeavoured to establish between the Anglican and the other Protestant churches. Catholics hold succession to consist in a series of men, each one of whom received ordination, and who follow each other from the time of the apostles to the present day. This is also the idea which Anglicans entertain of apostolic succession. In Whitaker's days, the matter was not so understood. "They," says he, "are successors of the apostles, who, being lawfully called, faithfully discharge their ministry in the Church, *although not in a continuous series* from the apostles."* By being lawfully called, Whitaker cannot mean more than the twenty-third article, according to which those "are lawfully called who have public authority given unto them in the congregation." To suppose that Whitaker requires ordination by one who could trace his succession to the apostles, would be to make him contradict himself. Again he says: "With them (Catholics) those only are lawful pastors who are called and created according to their order; but we say that their ministry is corrupt, and therefore that we ought not to be made or created bishops by them."†

He maintains from the words of St. Paul to Timothy, 1 Ep. iv. 14, that simple priests may make bishops: and, without making any distinction between the Anglican and the other Protestant churches, says: "For our bishops and ministers, although they are not ordained by Popish bishops, are still duly and lawfully ordained, according to the law of Christ; and as the apostles have prescribed to them, most faithfully govern the churches in which they exercise the ministry."‡ Again, Whitaker tells his adversary, that ordination in the sense of Catholics, and of most Anglicans, since the appearance of Mason's book, is not necessary to constitute a bishop. "We say and affirm, that those churches

* Succedunt Apostolis qui vocati legitime funguntur fideliter in Ecclesia munere suo, etsi non continua ab Apostolis serie.

† Apud illos quidem ii tantum sunt legitimi pastores, qui secundum certum ordinem vocantur et creantur; at nos dicimus corruptum esse eorum ministerium, ideoque non debere nos ab illis episcopos fieri aut creari.

‡ Nam nostri episcopi et ministri, etsi non sint a Papisticis Episcopis ordinati, tamen rite et legitime ordinantur, juxta Christi legem et quemadmodum Apostoli ipsis præscripserunt, suasque ecclesias in quibus ministerio suo funguntur, fidelissime regunt.

which they (Catholics) call Lutheran, have legitimate succession and ordination although not Popish, and therefore that there are true bishops in those churches."* Bellarmin had objected to the so called bishops of the Lutheran Church, that they had not been consecrated by three bishops, and not even by one, which, in case of necessity, would be sufficient. Whitaker meets this objection on true Zuinglian principles, "The bishops of those times, from whom they ought not to receive orders, were not bishops, but wolves. Orders, therefore, were not to be sought for, or accepted, at their hands."† Further on, he maintains that the power of calling implies the power of ordaining: "But if he grants that the calling (by election) is lawful, we are not troubled concerning orders. For those who have the power of calling, also have the power of ordaining, if lawful ordination cannot be obtained."‡ This was precisely the opinion avowed by Cranmer. Whitaker shews that such necessity existed at the time of the Reformation. "For as to the bishops of those times, they never could be induced to ordain any one who was not entirely of their party. And if they refused to ordain those who were lawfully called, it was necessary to look elsewhere for ordination."§ He, elsewhere, lays down that simple priests can ordain; and boldly denies that the external succession of the ministry is a certain note or mark of the Church.‖ In the supposition of Parker having received consecration, at the hands of a duly consecrated bishop, how is it possible to account for Whitaker's total silence on that subject? Can we believe that, had such been the case, he would have used the reasoning and uttered the language, which, on this occasion, he so frequently employs?

Dr. William Fulke, an Anglican divine, of considerable note in his day, published several books of controversy, between the years

* Nos dicimus et affirmamus Ecclesias illas quas ipsi vocant Lutheranas habere legitimam successionem et ordinationem sed non papisticam et proinde in illis ecclesiis veros episcopos esse.

† Episcopi qui tunc erant et a quibus ordinari non debuerunt, episcopi non erant sed lupi. Ergo ordinatio ab ipsis petenda aut accipienda non erat.

‡ Quod si vocationem nostrorum episcoporum (electione) legitimam esse concedat, de ordinatione non laboramus. Qui autem auctoritatem habent vocandi, iidem etiam auctoritatem ordinandi habent, si legitima ordinatio impetrari non possit.

§ Ad episcopos illorum temporum quod attinet, illi nunquam induci potuerunt ut quemquam ordinarent, nisi qui illis per omnia faverent. Quod si illi recusaverint ordinare legitime vocatos, necesse est aliunde ordinationem accipere.

‖ Ergo externam successionem atque ordinationem non esse firmam Ecclesiæ notam confiteris.

1571 and 1583. This writer endeavoured to elude the argument of Stapleton, against the Anglican Church, derived from the notorious want of succession in its ministry, by imagining a local, and secret, but real succession. Stapleton laid open the futility of this conjecture, by shewing, that there was no succession where there were no orders. He says, that the new masters of Fulke had invaded the ecclesiastical sees without mission or ordination. How could Stapleton have made this assertion, on the supposition of Parker's consecration by Barlow, if Barlow were, indeed, a bishop? The language of Fulke rivals in coarseness the ribaldry of Luther and the impiety of Calvin. "You are highly deceived," he says, "if you think we esteem your offices of bishops, priests, and deacons, better than laymen." And in his "Retentive," he says: "With all our hearts we defy, abhor, detest, and spit at your stinking, greasy, and anti-christian orders."*

Kellison (1608) attributes to Sutcliffe, another of the Elizabethan divines, the following argument by which he shewed that the Pope was no bishop, and therefore could not consecrate a bishop. "Antichrist cannot ordain; but the Pope is Antichrist, consequently he cannot ordain."† Le Quien, from whom I have taken this extract, intimates a change in the language of Sutcliffe, at a subsequent time, and gives the reader to understand that he did not always persist in denying the power of the Pope to consecrate a bishop. "Sutcliffe," says he, "before he heard of Parker's consecration by Barlow, and of the register, held the same language as Whitaker and Fulke regarding the mission of the Anglican bishops, and did not regard it as necessary that the leaders of the sect should have received ordination in the Catholic Church, or according to the ancient rite." Sutcliffe's reference to the act of Parker's consecration by Barlow, will be given in Chapter IV. of this work.

Gabriel Powel, another Anglican divine, cited by Le Quien, says, "The Popish ordination is nothing else than a mere profanation,—nor is there in Popery any ecclesiastical vocation."‡

These divines were true representatives of the principles of the first English reformers; nor does their language differ in substance from that held by one who, after Archbishop Cranmer, has the

* Apud Ward. † Examen of the Papacy.

‡ Papistica ordinatio nihil aluid est quam mera profanatio,—neque enim est in Papatu ulla vocatio Ecclesiastica.—Apud Le Quien, t. 1, p. 356.

strongest claim to be regarded as speaking the sentiments of the Anglican Church in the first period of its existence. In Jewel's famous "Apologie of the Church of England"—a work written in the name of that Church—he says: "God's grace is promised to a good mynde, and to one that feareth God, *not unto sees and successions*."* The late Mr. Froude got out of all patience with this boasted champion of Anglicanism, who, he tells us, "laughs at the apostolical succession, both in principle and as a fact, and says, that the only succession worth having is succession of doctrine."†

The denial of the validity of the consecration of the first Anglican bishops by distinguished Catholic divines, during the lifetime of Queen Elizabeth, must, from the facts and testimonies adduced in this chapter, be considered as established. In addition to the remarks already made on each particular portion of this evidence, I beg to make some observations which will serve as a summary of the whole matter.

1. It is undeniable that the validity of Anglican ordinations was denied throughout the whole reign of Elizabeth; and not insisted upon by the advocates of Anglicanism.

2. It is impossible to suppose that a mere legal informality, and that informality more apparent than real, could have given rise to this general outcry against the orders of the Anglican church.

3. That the rite employed in the conferring of orders in that church was different from that prescribed in the Roman Pontifical, would not, of itself, and without explanation, have justified the oft repeated assertion, that the Anglican bishops were no bishops. The Greek rite of ordination is different from that of the Latin church; yet this latter has always admitted the validity of the Greek orders.

4. The fact that the Anglican Church is an heretical and schismatical communion, could not have made Harding, Stapleton, Sanders, &c., men well versed in the science of theology and canon law, reject the Anglican orders as invalid. The Greek Church is both schismatical and heretical, and yet its orders are undisputed. Besides, in Chapter VII. it will be seen that the

* London, 1564.—Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, writing to John Wolphius, in Switzerland, says—"He (Jewel,) published it, (the Apology,) in the name of all." Is (Jewellus,) omnium nostrum nomine edidit.—Strype, App. t. II.

† Froude's Remains, vol. 1, p. 339,—who refers to Defence of the Apologie, pp. 120, 123, 139; edition of 1611.

orders conferred by the English bishops, after the schism, but before the establishment of the ordinal of Edward, were held to be valid.

5. That the first Anglican bishops did not communicate with the Pope, or the other bishops of the Catholic world, shows that they were schismatics, as were the English bishops in the latter part of Henry VIII.'s reign, but does not affect the validity of their consecration.

6. The Catholic writers who in the beginning of the seventeenth century, impugned the ordinations of the English church, quote the authority of the writers who had preceded them in the latter half of the sixteenth century, with many of whom they had lived and been familiar, and give no indication which would authorize us to infer that they had changed the ground of objection to Anglican orders, a thing which they most certainly would have done had their predecessors in the controversy objected solely on legal or doctrinal grounds.

7. The advocates of Anglicanism, after the appearance of Mason's book, in 1613, defend the English orders on very different principles from those which were urged by their predecessors, on the same side, in the time of Elizabeth.

8. The defenders of Anglican orders who wrote in the early part of the seventeenth century, never objected to their adversaries, that they had originated the objections which they urged, and about which, consequently, their predecessors had been silent. So far from this being the case, these writers professed to vindicate their orders from the exceptions taken to them by the ancient as well as by the then modern impugners of the ministerial grade. These exceptions were evidently not so much doctrinal as historical. Omitting, for the present, other citations very pertinent to the subject, but which will find their place more appropriately in a succeeding chapter, I shall quote a passage from Mason, who, on the title page of his work, professes to clear the bishops of the Church of England from the *slanders and odious imputations* of Bellarmine, Bristow, Harding, Allen, Stapleton, Parsons, Kellison, Eudemon, Becanus and other Romanists. Were these "slanders and odious imputations," thus attributed to some of the greatest and best men of the sixteenth century, nothing more than exceptions taken to Anglican orders, from a mere legal informality, or from a defective ritual, or from a schismatical

separation from the see of Rome, the centre of Catholic unity? "Slanders and odious imputations" necessarily refer to facts, not principles, and, in Mason's work, can have no other signification.

The work just mentioned forms an epoch in the ordination controversy. Before its publication, it does not appear that any plausible answer was given to the objections urged by Catholic writers. The replies that were offered were either artful evasions, or coarse and vituperative ridicule of the ceremonial of Catholic ordination. Mr. Evans endeavours to diminish the force of the inference I drew from the language of Whitaker and Fulke, both distinguished divines of the Church of England, in the time of Elizabeth; and he affects to consider their presbyterian sentiments as an unfair exposition of the principles of the Elizabethan divines on the subject of ordination. But if Whitaker and Fulke were presbyterian, they were by no means singular among their brethren in the ministry of the English church, which then could not be reproached, as has since been the case, with the inconsistency of having a Calvinistic creed and an Arminian clergy.

I shall conclude this portion of the investigation by an authority to which no exception can be taken, and which shows that the objections of the Catholic divines in Elizabeth's time had neither merely legal or merely ritual grounds, but the fact that there was no Catholic bishop to confer orders. In the *Overthrow of Stapleton's Fortress*, by Dr. Fulke, whose coarse language in disparagement of Catholic orders has just been quoted, we read as follows: "Where he (Stapleton) saith, that when all the popish bishops were deposed, there was none to lay hands on the bishops that should be newly consecrated, it is utterly false; for there was one of the popish bishops that continued in his place, there were also divers that were consecrated bishops in King Edward's time."* It appears, then, that Stapleton objected to the new prelates that there was none to lay hands on them; and, consequently, that he did not ground his objections solely on the non-revival of Edward's ordinal, or on its defective character. Mr. Palmer acknowledges that the Catholic writers denied the fact of any consecration having been received by the first Anglican bishops. His words are: "Osoruis, Weston, Bristow, Stapleton, Harding, Sanders and others, asserted confidently the direct falsehood, that

* *Overthrow*, etc., cap. viii., p. 113, London, 1580, cited by Mr. Haddan, apud Evans, p. 121.

the English bishops had not received any imposition of hands, and that there was no rite of ordination whatever employed. However, as a resource against those who might deny this assertion, they kept in reserve the jesuitical evasion, that they only meant a *legitimate and canonical* imposition of hands or other ceremony."* It would be difficult to find any one more ready to contradict himself than Mr. Palmer has been in the sentences just cited. If the writers referred to, asserted what he styles the direct falsehood, "that no rite of ordination *whatever*" had been employed in the inauguration of the first English bishops, how could they have restricted this denial to a legitimate and canonical imposition of hands, there being but *one* such? Mr. Palmer's testimony as to the fact stated in the first sentence above quoted from him, is a strong corroboration of the point, to establish which is the object of the present chapter.

That a dark cloud involved the origin of the Anglican hierarchy, even at a very early period after the supposed consecration of its first prelates, we learn from Mason, who, in his "Epistle Dedicatorie" to Archbishop Abbott,—after speaking of the "overmuch boldness of speech" which the act of 1556 rebuked, but did not silence, says: "Whereupon I wished from the bottom of my heart, that some learned man would have vouchsafed for the glory of God and the good of the Church, to scatter those popish mists, and to set the truth in a clearer light."—Although fifty years had passed away, since the first protestant Anglican bishops had been reproached with the invalidity of their orders, and the charge had been since then frequently repeated, no one had arisen to vindicate them—at least to Mason's satisfaction, from the "slanders and odious imputations" accumulated on them, not by a few, undistinguished and disreputable individuals, but by many eminent and excellent men. Meanwhile, as is evident from the following extract from the same 'epistle,' many conscientious Anglicans declined to take orders in the Church, and others returned to the communion of the mother Church, in consequence of the 'popish mists' which involved the origin of a Church, not half a century old, in embarrassing obscurity. "If any," says Mason, "have formerly made scruple to enter our orders, out of ignorance, how the odious and scandalous imputations, blazed in Popish books, might be truly answered and the point cleared by record,—

* A Treatise on the Church of Christ, vol. ii., p. 433. New York, 1841.

(This marked reference to the record is not without its significancy. Mason evidently struck out a new path for himself.)—"And if any upon this surmise bee fallen away to our adversaries, who knoweth what effect God may worke in them when they shall plainly see how they have been deluded with Popish stratagems." All the light which Mason was able to shed on this subject, has not dissipated the "popish mists" which he commemorated more than two centuries ago: and the doubtful character of its origin is still for the Anglican hierarchy, a reproach of which its members may complain, but which they will never be able to consign to oblivion.

NOTE ON THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN HARDING AND JEWEL.

In the first edition of this work, this controversy was stated in the following terms. I have numbered the paragraphs, for the purpose of reference in the observations which follow.

1. "In 1562, Bishop Jewel published his famous "*Apology for the Church of England*," to which Harding published in 1563, a reply entitled; "*Confutation of the Apology of the Church of England; Antwerp*, 1563." In this he says:—"Therefore, to go from your succession, which you cannot prove, and to come to your vocation (orders,) how say you, Sir? You bear yourself as though you were bishop of Salisbury? But how can you prove your vocation? By what authority usurp you the ministration of doctrine and sacraments? What can you allege for the right and proof of your ministry? Who hath laid hands on you? By what example hath he done it? How and by whom are you consecrated? Who hath sent you? Who hath committed to you the office you take upon you? Be you a priest or be you not? If you be not, how dare you usurp the name and office a bishop? If you be, tell us who gave you orders?"*

2. "The reply of Jewel is remarkable for its evasive character. Harding had asked; "by whom he was made priest,"—using the word "priest," in the more enlarged sense of bishop, who is nothing more than a priest of the first order, because endowed with the plenitude of the sacerdotal power. Taking advantage of this ambiguity, which the context, as may be seen by the concluding sentence of the above extract, sufficiently removed, Jewel an-

* Confutation, part II., c. 5, pp. 57, 58.

swered:—"Since it pleases you" (I translate from the Latin) "to demand from me my letters of ordination; and to ask me, as if you had any authority for so doing, whether I am a priest or not; who imposed hands on me; how I have been ordained: I answer, that I was made a priest long since, by the same rite and title, and, if I mistake not, by the same person and by the same hands, by which you, yourself, Harding, were made a priest, in the time of Edward VI., that excellent prince. Therefore, you cannot doubt of my priesthood, unless you call your own also into question." Harding immediately replied; he denied that Jewel was ordained priest, either at the same time, or in the same manner, or by the same hands, that he, Harding, had been ordained; or, indeed, in the time of Edward VI. He then continues: "But you have not answered half my question. For I laid down this foundation from St. Jerome; There is no church where there is no priest; for the word 'sacerdos,' (priest) signifies as you well know, not only a simple priest but a bishop. Therefore, I ask you as much about your promotion to the episcopal dignity, as to the priesthood. Suffer me, then, to recall my words once more to you. I wrote thus, and you have not yet answered; let us not now discuss your succession, which you cannot prove, and come to the investigation of your vocation (orders)."

3. Although Jewel published a third work in the same year, 1568, in which he pretended to answer Harding's book, he observed a profound silence on the important subject of his consecration. Nothing but the fact, that he could not satisfactorily explain that circumstance, can account for the insincerity displayed in the following answer which he makes to the question: "was he a bishop?" "You ask me," says he, "as if you were my Metropolitan, if I am a bishop or not. I answer: I am a bishop by the free, customary, and canonical ELECTION of the whole Chapter of Salisbury, assembled for that purpose, and of which you, Harding, were then a member; and, as I heard, were present in your own person with your brethren, and gave your free and public suffrage to that same election. If you deny that, take care lest you be found to give testimony against yourself."* Harding, in reply, denied that he was present at the election, that he had given his suffrage, or that that election had been canonical,—it

* Jewel, 129.

having been solely caused by the dread of the Queen's power;—and Jewel, at length, finding all evasion fruitless, in a subsequent work, declares, that he had been consecrated by his Archbishop, assisted by three other bishops, and had been recognized as a bishop by the Queen. To this Harding replied: "But you were made, you say, by the consecration of the Archbishop (Parker) and other three bishops. And how, I pray you, was your Archbishop himself consecrated? What three bishops were there in the realm to lay hands upon him? You have made the matter worse than I had objected it to you. Your Metropolitan, who should give authority to all your consecrations, had himself no lawful consecration. There were, indeed, some lawful bishops in the kingdom, who either were not required to impose hands on you; or who, being required, refused to do so." Jewel made no further answer to this charge. In another place, Harding, writing shortly after the famous act of 1566, says:—"If you will needs have your matters seem to depend of your Parliament, let us not be blamed if we call it a Parliament religion, Parliament Gospel, Parliament faith."*

4. "I have been diffuse in my extracts from this controversy, for the same two reasons as Champney, from whom I copy, assigns for his still more prolix quotations. First, that the reader may see that the consecration of Parker was denied immediately after it is supposed to have occurred by one every way qualified to bear testimony on the occasion;—one who was probably in England, when it is said to have taken place, and who, by reason of his temporary adherence to the protestant party, as well as by his established character for learning and sincerity, may be looked upon by all as an unsuspicious evidence;† while by the Catholic, who venerates him as one of those who perilled all for the preservation

* Confutation of the Apology, part 6, c. 2, quoted by Mason. Mr. Russell trembles for my accuracy or honesty, in the statement that Harding derived the title of "parliamentary bishop" from the Act of 1566, although the work in which this observation occurs was, according to me, published in 1565. I copied the passage from Mason, who gives it in connection with observations on the Act of 1566. May not the apparent contradiction be removed, by the very probable supposition that Mason quoted a later edition of the "Confutation," which, doubtless, would contain something not found in the first? No one can doubt that the phrase "parliamentary bishops," owes its origin to the Act of 1566. "Henceforward, (i. e. after 1566,) Sanders and others railed on them for parliamentary bishops, deriving all their power and commission from the State."—(Fuller, Book IX., sec. 2.)

† For an account of the controversy between Jewel and Harding, see Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*. Art. Jewel.

of religion, his words will be received with a respect due to the character of a confessor of the faith. And secondly, because the final silence of Jewel, after his repeated tergiversations, is a proof, that he could not sustain the consecration of Parker, from whom he confessed, although with considerable reluctance, that he himself had received consecration."

Mr. Russell accuses me of great unfairness in the foregoing statement of this controversy, and Mr. Evans has re-echoed the charge in the pages of the "*True Catholic*,"*—an Episcopalian periodical, antiphrastically so called, published in Baltimore; and he acknowledges, with a combination of modesty and generosity, deserving of all admiration, that this was the only weak point in his own reply to me, which, in every other respect, he regards as triumphant. After quoting without any material omission, the part of my former account of the controversy between Jewel and Harding, in paragraphs 1, 2, 3, Mr. Russell proceeds:—

"Conscious of the weakness of his cause, Dr. Kenrick here, as elsewhere, has recourse to falsification. He gives his reader to understand, that when Harding questioned Jewel about his *episcopal* character, Jewel evaded the inquiry by alluding to his ordination as *priest*: that when Harding, in reply, again pressed him on the subject of his *consecration*, he again evaded his opponent's interrogation by saying that he was a Bishop by free and canonical *election*:" and that "*at length*, finding all further evasion fruitless, *in a subsequent work*," he reluctantly confessed that he had been consecrated by his Metropolitan. Will it be credited that these replies of Jewel (which according to the above statement, were forced from him at different times, by repeated questionings) will be found following each other consecutively in the first edition, (that of 1567) of the "Defence of the Apology," the first book which he put forth in answer to Harding? Yet such is the fact, as the following quotation will show.

"'Whereas it further pleaseth you to call for my letters of orders, and to demand of me, as by some authority, whether I be a priest or no? What hands were laid over me: and by what order I was made? I answer you: I am a priest made long sithence by the same order and ordinance, and I think also by the same man, and the same hands, that you, M. Harding, were made priest by in the late time of that most vertuous prince, King Edward the

* No. for November, 1846.

Sixth. Therefore ye cannot well doubt of my priesthood, without like doubting of your own.

"'Further, as if you were my metropolitane, ye demand of me, whether I be a bishop or no? I answer you: I am a bishop, and that by the free and accustomed canonical election of the whole chapter of Sarisburie assembled solemnlie together, for that purpose. Of which companie you, M. Harding, were then one, and as I was informed, being present, there in your owne person, amongst your brethren, gave free and open consent unto the election. If you denie this, take heed your own breath blowe not against you.

"'As for the impertinent tales of Ischyras and Zacchaeus, they touch us nothing. They were none of ours: we know them not. Our bishops are made in the forme and order, as they have been ever, by free election of the chapter: by consecration of the archbishop and other three bishops, and by the admission of the prince.'

"The above extract speaks for itself, and convicts Dr. Kenrick of the grossest misrepresentation. It proves that Jewel's allusion to his consecration, said, by Dr. Kenrick, to have been made in a subsequent publication, and not until after repeated evasions, occurs in his first reply to Harding, and in the same page with this reference to his ordination to the Priesthood."—Refutation, pp. 29, 30.

If, as Mr. Russell asserts, the replies of Jewel, just quoted, were given by him at once and consecutively, then I am very willing to acknowledge the inaccuracy of my original statement,—an acknowledgment, which, for reasons presently to be mentioned, I can make without admitting the injurious consequences which Mr. Russell has drawn from the supposed error. Whatever unfairness there is in the matter is more justly attributable to Mr. Russell himself, than to the writer whom he so severely condemns. I beg the reader's attention to paragraph above numbered 4, from which it appears that I did not profess to cite from the original works of Jewel or Harding, but from Champney, whose account of the controversy I abridged. Before accusing me in such unmeasured language, did not justice require Mr. Russell to examine, whether the relation of Champney sustained my statement, and if so, while exposing the inaccuracy, not studiously to keep from the reader the fact that I had been deceived by the authority on which I had

relied. An honourable adversary would have done this: but this, I am sorry to say, Mr. Russell has not done. Nay more, he mutilates an extract from my work, and welds together two sentences, in order to keep from his readers the fact, that in this matter I professed to follow the authority of Champney. Towards the end of his remarks on this subject, he says:—

"Dr. Kenrick goes on to say:—'I have been diffuse in my extracts from this controversy . . . . . first that the reader may see that the consecration of Parker was denied immediately after it is supposed to have occurred, by one every way qualified,'" &c. (*ut supra.*)

My words were, "I have been diffuse in my extracts from this controversy, for the same two reasons as Champney, from whom I copy, assigns for his still more prolix quotations." While the reader is admiring this specimen of Mr. Russell's skill in quoting, let him remember the heavy accusations that gentleman has grounded on this misrepresentation of the writer whom he professes to refute. Did my former or present work exhibit any thing approaching the unfairness of which Mr. Russell here is shown to be guilty, I should indeed not only blush for myself, but distrust the cause that could require such tactics to be employed in its defence.

But if I am not liable to the charge of misrepresenting the controversy between Harding and Jewel, have I not been, at least, inaccurate in my statement of it? In the absence of the original editions of the works referred to, and which, as I shall presently show, Mr. Russell himself appears not to have seen, I am unable to give this assertion a positive denial, but I venture to maintain the opinion, that my former relation of the controversy is not a mis-statement, but a true account of what occurred. My motives for making this assertion are, 1. The internal evidence which that statement affords that such was the case; 2. The authority of Champney, in the extract given from his work, which appears to justify my statement; and 3, the authority of a very respectable and most laborious scholar, regarding the dates of the different parts of this controversy, which justify me in believing that Mr. Russell is mistaken in the assertion he so positively makes; that Jewel answered Harding *first* in 1567.

If in the original edition of Jewel's reply to Harding, the three paragraphs above taken from Mr. Russell's work were given as

there found, how could Harding have used the following language, in his answer to that reply of Jewel.

"But you have not answered *half my question.* For I laid down this foundation from St. Jerome. There is no church where there is no priest; for the word '*sacerdos*' (priest) signifies as you well know, not only a simple priest but a bishop. Therefore I ask you as much about your promotion to *the episcopal dignity as to the priesthood.* Suffer me then to recall my words once more to you. I wrote thus, and you have not answered; let us now discuss your succession which you cannot prove, and come to the investigation of your orders."

Had Jewel, in his reply, referred to his election to the see of Salisbury, as is done in the second of the three paragraphs quoted from him; or had he not contented himself with a reference to his priestly ordination, how could Harding have reproached him with having given a "*half answer*" to his question, and with having *availed himself of the ambiguous word 'priest,' for the purpose of evading a reply?* If Jewel had stated his election to the see of Salisbury, and consecration in 1567, how could Harding in 1568 have addressed him as he did in this latter year?

But is it certain that Jewel first answered Harding in 1567? This Mr. Russell asserts, as does also a correspondent of the 'True Catholic.'* The late Charles Butler, of Lincoln's Inn, London, than whom a more exact and trustworthy scholar, when there is question of facts, need not be desired, assigns an earlier date for the "Confutation" and "Defence," than that given in Mr. Russell's 'Refutation.' His words are:

"In 1562, Bishop Jewel published in the Latin language his celebrated *Apology for the Church of England.* It was translated into the English, Greek, and several other languages. Dr. Harding replied to it by his *Confutation of the Apology of the Church of England, Antwerp,* 1563. Dr. Jewel replied by his Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, London, 1564. This became even a more popular work than his apology. Dr. Harding answered it by his Detection of sundry foul errors, lies, slanders, corruptions, &c., uttered and practised by M. Jewel, in a book lately by him set forth, called an Answer, &c. Louvaine, 1568. To this the bishop published an answer in the same year."†

* Nov. 1846, p. 306.

† Historical Memoirs of the English, Irish and Scotch Catholics, since the Re-

The correspondent of the 'True Catholic,' informs us that in the General Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church, (New York,) is an edition of Bishop Jewel's works, London, A. D., 1611. "I do not find there," he says, "the edition of 1567. The title page to the 'Defence,' in this edition is as follows: 'A Defence of the Apologie of the Church of England, containing an answer to a certain book lately set forth by Mr. Harding, and entitled, A Confutation of &c., whereunto there is also newly added, An Answer unto another like Booke written by the said M. Harding, entituled, A Detection of sundry foule errours, &c. Printed at Louvain, A. D., 1568, AND INSERTED INTO THE FORMER AS OCCASION AND PLACE REQUIRED,* as by special notes added to the margin it may appear. By John Jewel, Bishop of Salisburie.'"

"Although this edition is not the earliest one, the original Defence is distinguished from the additions, and the above passage, (the three paragraphs referred to) was in the first edition. The first edition was in 1567, and the second in 1570, (or end of 1569?")

As neither Mr. Russell nor the writer of the foregoing extract, knew of any edition earlier than that of 1567; and as Mr. Butler tells us there was an edition of 1564, may it not have been that in the edition of 1569 or 1570, was *incorporated* a reply to Harding's *Detection;* as was the case with the edition of 1611? Is it not possible, that the distinction between the original Defence and the additions may not have always been accurately noted? And thus, that the replies, given at different times, may now, in the absence of the original editions, appear to have been given at one and the same time? There were besides, more editions than one of these works, following each other within a short space of time. Thus the 'Confutation,' by Harding, appeared in 1563 and 1565; and the 'Defence,' by Jewel, in 1564 and 1567.

This is, indeed, only a conjecture; but a conjecture which the intrinsic evidence above referred to, makes probable. How else account for the reproach of half answering made by Harding in his 'Confutation?' The custom, which subsequently, as in the

formation, vol. iv., p. 413. London. I may add, Strype refers to an edition of the "Apologie," of 1562; and that Harding's reply soon followed may be inferred from Jewel's letter to Bullinger, in which he says—Vix dum absolveram, evolat extemplo apologiæ nostræ Confutatio.—8th Feb 1566, Strype, II. App., 88.—("I had scarcely finished it (the Apology,) when a Confutation of it springs up."

* The capitals are my own.

edition of 1611, may be fairly supposed to have then prevailed,—of incorporating the vindication of a work in a new edition of the same, is certainly favourable to the hypothesis that, as in 1611, so in 1567-1568, the 'Answer' of 1568 was inserted in the 'Defence' of 1564, 'AS OCCASION AND PLACE REQUIRED.'

I have now to consider the second point alleged against me by Mr. Russell, on which he prefers a charge no less grave than that of "untruth,"—namely, my assertion that Jewel, in a work published in 1568, observed a profound silence on the important subject of his consecration. It may be asked, in the first place, how this assertion can be made, whereas in his "Defence," published in 1567, he refers to his election, and, indirectly at least, to his consecration. Admitting, what I am not able to disprove by a reference to the original edition, but which the motives just alleged appear to render exceedingly improbable, that Jewel did thus reply in his "Defence," when first published, in 1564—did say, as we now read:—"Our bishops are made in form and order, as they have been ever by free election of the Chapter, by consecration of the Archbishop, and by admission of the Prince,"—I observe that he does not state directly that *he* had been so made, although it is evident he wished this to be inferred. His answer, however, is not so explicit, as when he replied that he had received priests' orders; and, perhaps, this vague general assertion was deemed by Harding a sufficient motive for charging him with evading the real question,—a conjecture which, even in the case that the two paragraphs, Nos. 1 and 2, appeared, originally, in the same book, might countenance the reproach subsequently made to him by Harding, that he had given but a *half answer* to his question.

I now copy that part of paragraph No. 3, adding the words marked in italics, the omission of which Mr. Russell charges on me as a suppression.

"*If you had been consecrated after the form and order that hath ever been used, ye might have had bishops out of France to have consecrated you, in case there had lacked in England.* There were, indeed, some lawful bishops in the kingdom, who either were not required to impose hands on you; or who, being required, refused to do so, *which is an evident sign that ye sought not such a consecration as had been ever used, but such a one whereof all the former bishops were ashamed.*"

As to the supposed suppression, a reference to the extract from Champney, inserted in page 53, etc., will show that I faithfully copied him, in whose book the "suppressed" words are not found; neither are they found in Courayer, quoting Harding, as cited by Mr. Evans,* which is a sufficient refutation of the charge; as also a proof that the omitted words are not of that importance attached to them by Mr. Russell.

This gentleman affirms, that Harding did not deny that Parker had been consecrated; but objected, that he had not been consecrated "after the form and order which hath ever been used;" in other words "by the Roman Ritual and with the confirmation by the Pope;" and he charges me with suppressing the parts of the above extract which I have copied from his book. This was done, he says, from a desire to keep from the reader Harding's real grounds for denying lawful consecration to Parker.

I have already shown that there was no suppression on my part; and that Champney, whom I copied, could not have had such a motive, will appear manifest, if we closely examine the force of the omitted passages. Harding was adduced solely for the purpose of showing that he denied Parker's consecration. His reference to the French bishops had nothing whatever to do with the point. So far from diminishing the weight of the argument founded on his text, it would rather have increased it, since it expressly affirms, that all the ancient bishops refused to consecrate Parker; an assertion incompatible with the admission that Parker was consecrated by Barlow, and that Barlow was one of these bishops. In a subsequent extract from Harding, a passage is cited which is stated to precede that just quoted, and in which he undertakes to show that the Elizabethan bishops were not made in form and order, because they neither communicated their election to the other bishops of the west, as had been the more ancient custom, nor had been confirmed by the Pope. Hence, he concludes, that they were not Catholic bishops.

It must be borne in mind that there is, and always has been, a broad distinction between the confirmation and the consecration of a bishop. By consecration, the episcopal character is conferred; by confirmation, the person who has received it, or who is to receive it, is recognized as a member of the Catholic hierarchy,

* Essays, p. 134.

and vested with jurisdiction over the diocese to which he is named. In the promotion of the Elizabethan bishops, there were manifold irregularities. They did not receive confirmation from the Pope, and thus were excluded from Catholic communion. They did not communicate with the other bishops of the Catholic world; for if they had, they could have got bishops from France to consecrate them, whereas the ancient bishops of their own kingdom either were not required, or if required, refused to do so. Does not this assertion of Harding prove to demonstration that, if consecrated at all, the first Anglican bishops were not consecrated by any of the ancient bishops, and, therefore, not by any who had received the imposition of hands, in the time of Henry VIII.? Whether validly consecrated or not, they were not Catholic bishops, from the schismatical character of their promotion. Besides the defect of communion with the Pope, there was the defect of their consecration, which was "such as had never been used;" "such whereof all the former bishops were ashamed," who, therefore, Harding says, refused to consecrate them. Harding did not, as Mr. Russell and others, whose mistake is more surprising, suppose, confound things essentially distinct. Neither he, nor any other Catholic divine of that day, admitted that the bishops consecrated in England after the separation from Rome, and during the life of Henry VIII., were Catholic bishops; because they were attached to a schism, that cut them off from the communion of the Church; and yet nowhere do we find these uncatholic bishops charged with not having received consecration. On the contrary, we find their consecration allowed, in the assertion that they refused to consecrate; and hence, contrary to Mr. Russell's assertion, Harding could not have rejected the consecrations of the first Anglican bishops, merely on account of their not being in communion with the Pope, or with the other bishops of the Catholic world.

Moreover, the advocates of Anglican ordinations cannot reconcile with Harding's knowledge of Parker's consecration by Barlow, the assertion that the ancient bishops who were in England refused to consecrate the Elizabethan bishops. Mr. Russell will not deny that Barlow was one of these ancient bishops, and consequently the refusal of the ancient bishops asserted by Harding in such unqualified terms, during the first ten years of the reign of Elizabeth, implies his ignorance of the supposed Lambeth consecration of

Parker, or his conviction that Barlow, who is said to have been the consecrating prelate on that occasion, was not one of the ancient bishops.

Mr. Russell cites Jewel's reply to Harding's question, asking what letters of communion the Elizabethan bishops had written to the bishops of the Catholic world, or to the bishop of Rome, and observes, that the circumstance of its having been penned convicts me of "untruth," as I stated that Jewel made no answer to his opponent's charge against his metropolitan. Again I beg to recall to the reader's mind the obvious distinction between communion or confirmation, and consecration,—things which Mr. Russell perpetually confounds throughout this portion of his "Refutation." Jewel's reply refers only to the former, and cannot be understood of consecration. Unless Mr. Russell, then, has some passage more pertinent to the subject than the one adduced, I repeat the assertion that Jewel did not reply to Harding's question regarding his consecration or that of Parker; that he observed a profound silence on the subject; and I leave the reader to judge of the weight to be attributed to Mr. Russell's accusation.

Harding's denial of Parker's "lawful consecration," had other grounds than those assigned by the defenders of Anglican ordinations, namely, the use of a ritual different from that of Rome, and the want of letters of communion with the Pope. These were, indeed, serious objections to the new hierarchy; but they showed rather the unlawfulness than the invalidity of their consecration. That Harding did not dissent from the opinions of contemporary Catholic divines—Stapleton, Weston, Bristow, Sanders, Osorius, etc., we are bound to suppose; and that the Catholic divines denied that the first English bishops had been validly, or, indeed, at all ordained, has already been seen. Indeed, there is every reason to regard Harding as distinguished among his brethren for the strong denial that the Elizabethan bishops had received any consecration, "but such a one of which all former bishops would have been ashamed." Dodd, referring to the time that elapsed between the supposed consecration of Parker, 1559, and the appearance of Mason's work in vindication of the English orders, says: "during which time the Protestants were pressed to show their succession and consecration by Sanders, Allen, Stapleton, Bristow, Rainolds, &c., *but more particularly by Harding*, who, in express terms, calls upon Jewel, and challenges him to produce

a register and show his succession and consecration."* Nor is Dodd alone in this appreciation of the character of Harding's objections to the consecration of the first Anglican bishops. Godwin, a Protestant writer, who was a contemporary with Harding, although he appears later on the field of literature, expressly states, that Harding assigned another locality for Parker's consecration than that of Lambeth,† which easily explains the allusion contained in the sentence which Mr. Russell has charged me with suppressing—that the consecration of the Elizabethan bishops was such a one as would have made all former bishops blush.

The account which Le Quien gives of this controversy, and which I have seen, for the first time, since writing the foregoing vindication of my original statement, fully sustains my description of it, and the manner in which I have maintained its accuracy. The subject is of sufficient importance to justify the long extract which I take from his work.

"Dr. Harding, being persuaded that these bishops had intruded themselves into the sees, for which they had been named, without having received any ordination, boldly asks Jewel to give him his episcopal genealogy—his succession in right line from the apostles. If he succeeds to them in the exercise of the episcopal functions by the way of ordinary vocation, he asks him to produce his letters of ordination—'If it be ordinarie, shew us the letters of your orders. At least shew us that you have received power to do the office you presume to exercise, by due order of laying on of hands and consecration. But order and consecration you have not. For who could give that to you of all these new ministers, howsoever else you call them, which he hath not himself.' He then asks him, 'To come to your vocation; how say you, sir, you bear yourself as though Bishop of Salisbury? How can you prove your vocation? Who hath called you? Who hath laid his hands on you? By what example hath he done it? How, and by whom, are you consecrated? Who hath sent you? Be you priest or be you not? If you be not, how dare you usurp the name and office of bishop? If you be, tell us who gave you orders? The institution of a priest was never but in the power of a bishop. Bishops have always, after the Apostles' time, according to the Ecclesiastical Canons, been consecrated by three

* Church History of England, since the Reformation, Vol. II., Appendix, p cclxxxiv.

† See Chap. VII.

bishops." Harding calls in question a fact, which, according to the Lambeth Register, must have been of public notoriety. He challenges Jewel to produce the act of his ordination—to name the three bishops who imposed hands on him. According to the register, Jewel was solemnly consecrated on the 21st January, 1559–1560, not only by three bishops, but by four,—by Mathew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindall, Bishop of London, Richard Cox, Bishop of Ely, and John Hodgkins of Bedford—and yet, Harding openly denies that his consecration was by three bishops. He asks, according to what rite, by what ceremony? Who made him priest—him who a short time before was only deacon? Who made him bishop?

"Jewel, replying to Harding, passes over in silence all these questions of his adversary, who, in his answer, *again* challenges him to shew that he had been made bishop by any other means than by letters patent of the queen.

"How does Jewel, so often challenged to prove his episcopal character, by producing his letters of ordination, by the former treasurer of his church, reply to Harding? Does he adduce the register of his consecration? Does he refer to the register of the Archbishop of Canterbury? Does he name those who had consecrated him? This would have closed his adversary's mouth. And yet he answers evasively. He asks, what canon of the Church requires a bishop to be ordained by three bishops. It is the celebrated Jewel, the great Protestant Anglican Doctor, that asks this question! He then refers to the sentiment of *Petrus a Palude* and of *Johannes Major*, who taught that one bishop would suffice to consecrate another, in case of necessity. He complains of the too great liberty taken by Harding, in asking for his letters of ordination—in calling on him, as if he were his metropolitan—to shew who had made him bishop. 'I am bishop,' he says, 'by the free and canonical election of the Chapter of Salisbury,' and after treating as fables the histories of Ischyras and Zacchaeus, he answers, in general terms: 'Our bishops are made, as they have always been, by the free election of the chapter and the consecration of the metropolitan and three other bishops.' It is good to observe the artifice (*detour*) of this reply. Jewel says, indeed, how bishops were made at the time when he wrote, after the convocation of the Clergy in 1562: but he does not say, in what way he himself had been made bishop; and this was the question

he had to answer. On this reply, Harding urges him still more closely: he begs him to tell him in what manner his archbishop himself had been consecrated, to be able to consecrate others:—what three bishops of the kingdom had imposed hands on him. 'You have now uttered a worse case for yourselves than was by me before named. For your metropolitan who should give authority to all your consecrations himself had no lawful consecration. If you had been consecrated after the form and order which hath ever been used, ye might have had bishops out of France to have consecrated you, in case there had lacked in England. But now there were ancient bishops enough in England, who either were not required or who refused to consecrate you, which is an evident sign, that ye sought not such a consecration as had ever been used, but such a one whereof all the former bishops were ashamed.'

"What Harding here says, that the ancient bishops were ashamed of the kind of consecration which these new bishops received, does not mean, as Courayer pretends, that they were ashamed to learn that they had been ordained according to the ordinal of Edward, in which were employed the imposition of hands and prayer, although the other ceremonies were omitted, not being judged necessary. Harding appears to allude to something more shameful, which had occurred in this promotion, and his words recall the expression of Bristow, that Parker and his associates had been consecrated 'in a ridiculous manner'—*ridicula quadam consecratione*,—a phrase more appropriately applied to the Nag's head consecration, than to the new rite of Edward VI. Add to this, the question which Harding puts to his adversary, who, as we have seen, was of Parker's party, 'How can you prove your vocation? Who has called you? Who imposed hands on you? After what manner did he do it? How, and by whom, have you been consecrated? What three bishops consecrated you?'—The ceremony observed in the consecration of Jewel and of the rest of Parker's party, must have been extraordinary, to give rise to such questions on the part of the Catholics. A consecration according to the ordinal of Edward was not without examples; and these recent ones. One of three things must be said: either the consecrator was but a simple priest, or the ceremony must have been very different from that of Edward's ordinal, or both defects must have been combined, so that occasion was given to call it a ridiculous, shameful, and unexampled consecra-

tion. We have seen that Godwin places Harding first among those who circulated the statement of the Nag's head consecration.* Harding himself supplies the proof of what I have said, namely, that he terms 'shameful' the manner in which Jewel and his companions had been made bishops, because it was not a real bishop but a simple priest who had performed the ceremony, when he says that it was well known that their bishops had not been consecrated by others, who succeeded in direct succession to the apostles, but who, by their own acknowledgment, had only the power of the priesthood.—'But seeing your bishops were neither consecrated by those who lineally succeeded the apostles, nor have, by your confession, more power of God's law than a priest, you have both false bishops without the true Church, and a false church without true bishops.'

"Nothing is more irreconcilable with the relation of the Lambeth Register, or is better calculated to show that it is not authentic, than this controversy between Harding and Jewel.

1. "It commences only a few years after the alleged consecrations of Parker, Jewel and the rest. Harding was in England when they were made bishops. He was treasurer of the Cathedral Church of Salisbury, and, consequently, he ought to know if Jewel had been really consecrated bishop of that Church. Neither could he be unaware of the consecration of Parker, if that ceremony took place on the 17th of December, 1559, with all the solemnity, and before such a concourse of people and of nobles, as is mentioned in the Register. And yet, Harding knew nothing of it in 1565, when he refuted Jewel's Apology, nor in 1568, when he composed his reply.

2. "It was not merely a dispute about the form of the ordination which they had received, whether it was valid or invalid. The question was, whether they had received any imposition of hands at all; if those who had made them bishops, were three in number, and had themselves the episcopal character. Harding calls on his opponent to name them, and receives no answer.

3. "Jewel's unwillingness to allow that the consecration of a bishop ought to be made by three, or at least by two, bishops; and his adoption of the opinion, that in case of necessity one alone suffices, shows very clearly, that he had been made bishop by one

* See Chapter VII. of this work.

alone, whom he regarded as such, and this can be none other than John Scory, as mentioned in the Nag's head history.

4. "The comparison of the ordination of these bishops with that of Ischyras, made by Colluthus, who was but a priest, obliges us to believe that these new bishops did not receive a more valid consecration, and that Harding knew that their promotion had been made by those who had never received the episcopal character.

5. "In saying that none of the ancient bishops consented to consecrate Parker and his companions, Harding furnishes us with an unanswerable argument against the consecration of Parker. Speaking of the Bishop of Landaff, who had taken the oath of Supremacy, he says:—'One I must except who is a true bishop by consecration (as I understand) though false man by apostasie, and going from his faith and from his religion.'* I shall soon have occasion to quote a passage of William Fulke, in reply to Stapleton, of the same import: that the Bishop of Landaff was the only one of the ancient bishops and of the ancient consecration, who acknowledged Elizabeth for Head of the English Church, and who might be thought disposed to impose hands on the new bishops named by Elizabeth. All agree that this prelate did not consecrate Parker, who, consequently, was not consecrated by one or more bishops of the ancient consecration. Whence it follows, either that Barlow, named in the Register, as Parker's consecrator, was not one of those ancient bishops, or was not at that time in England, to impose hands on his Metropolitan.

6. "Harding declares that the Bishop of Landaff was the only bishop consecrated according to the Catholic rite, to whom Jewel could address himself for consecration, if he wished to preserve the succession of the hierarchy. He knew that Landaff had refused to consecrate him. Jewel knew it also; and instead of silencing the Catholics by naming Barlow, who, according to the Register, consecrated the Archbishop, he remains silent. What are we to infer from this silence, except that the record of the consecration in the Register is a fabrication, and was entirely unknown to Jewel? This silence of Jewel, regarding the manner of his consecration, and his consecrator, is conclusive, because he was obliged to speak. He was called upon, urged, and chal-

* A Detection of Sundrie, &c.; Harding.

lenged to show his letters of consecration, to produce a register where they were consigned. 'Is your vocation,' asks Harding, 'ordinary or extraordinary? If it is ordinary, show us the letters of your consecration: at least show us that you have received the power to exercise your functions by an imposition of hands, and a consecration in due form. Urging him on the principle of Tertullian, *Let them show the origin of their Churches*, he asks him: whence have you sprung? Show us the register of your bishops who have succeeded one the other, until we come to an apostle or apostolic man. These questions required an answer; and the best answer would have been, the production of the Lambeth Register, which showed that Barlow consecrated Parker; but truth imposed silence on him; and after the lapse of forty-five years, a register is brought forward, which, if produced at the time of this controversy, as it might have been if it existed, would have terminated it.

"Bramhall admits this silence, and says, that he learns 'now, for the first time, how one may positively reply to what is objected against a man by observing silence. Jewel was the defender; he was not obliged to adduce his proofs. If Harding was not present at Parker's consecration, he might, had he wished, have satisfied himself on the subject by the records we have.'

"The answer of the Anglican Prelate is more ingenious than sincere. Does it not happen, every day, that he who defends a cause is obliged, especially if challenged thereto, as Jewel was by Harding, to produce his proofs. Were the consecration of Parker so solemn and notorious, as Bramhall alleges, Harding would have known it, without a reference to the records. A proof, that neither the consecration of Parker, nor of Jewel, was made in the manner now asserted, is found in the fact, that Harding, Treasurer of the Cathedral of Salisbury, knew nothing about it. Otherwise we should be forced to say, that he had lost his reason, to call it in question; and this alone would have sufficed to cover him with shame and confusion.

"It must, however, be acknowledged that if Jewel thought proper to dissemble the objection which Harding made against the vocation and succession of the prelates of his sect, and against their episcopal character, he afterwards undertook to answer the passage from Tertullian, 'Let them show the origin of their Churches,' which Harding had quoted to him. But how did he answer it? Did he show that he and his companions had suc-

ceeded the Catholic bishops by means of ordination? Did he produce the register of his Church, or of the Metropolitan? No; but he gives a false meaning to the words of Tertullian. According to him, they mean, 'let them show by whom their Churches have been commenced,—from whom they have received the doctrine that they teach;' and with a degree of audacity that belongs only to error, he retorts them on the Catholics, presuming to ask them, to show the first authors of their Churches,—those of whom they had learned the doctrine they professed. To refute, in a few words, this attempt at evasion, Harding again asks Jewel to observe that Tertullian immediately adds, 'Let them unfold the roll or series of their bishops.' He shows that to convict heretics of their novelty, Tertullian sends them to the rolls or records, to the acts and letters of ordination, by which they might be able to verify the succession of the bishops of each Church, and see, whether they preserved the succession uninterrupted from the time of the Apostles. Jewel did not find it proper to answer this question."*

Champney and Le Quien, writing apparently from the original works of Jewel and Harding, agree as to the evasive character of Jewel's reply, and both sustain, at least in substance, the account of it given in the first edition of this work.

A statement of this controversy, or rather of that part of it relating to the ordination of Jewel, is thus given by Humphreys, in a work published in 1573, immediately after Jewel's death, and dedicated to Archbishop Parker and Bishop Sandys. "He, (Harding,) the companion of Jewel in the ministry, attacks virulently his colleague, his countryman (Devionensem), his brother, his friend, that is, his other self; he says that he, (Jewel,) is no priest; although he was himself ordained at the same time and by the same person, I believe: that he is not a bishop; although he is said to have been present in the chapter of Salisbury at the election of Jewel, and to have voted for him." It is observable that Humphreys, after the example of Jewel, proves, that this latter was a priest, by referring to his ordination; and that to prove he was a bishop he refers to his election—making no mention of the circumstance of his consecration.†

* Nullité des ordinations, t. 1, pp. 289–308.

† P. 140, ed. 1573.

CHAPTER IV.

PARKER'S CONSECRATION.

MATHEW PARKER, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, is said, by the advocates of Anglican orders, to have received episcopal consecration on the 17th of December 1559, in the chapel of the archiepiscopal palace at Lambeth. The consecrating Prelate on this occasion was William Barlow, who was assisted by John Scory, Miles Coverdale, and John Hodgkins. Barlow and Hodgkins are said to have been consecrated according to the form in the Roman Pontifical, in the reign of Henry VIII.: the other two in the reign of Edward VI., and according to his ordinal. All Anglican writers who have referred to the subject from the time of Mason, assert this fact. Catholic writers have generally denied it, or regarded it as uncertain. It has been recently asserted by Dr. Lingard the celebrated English historian, by Rev. Mr. Tierney, the accomplished Editor of Dodd, and by Rev. Mr. Waterworth, the Author of very valuable historical lectures on the English Reformation. With these, and perhaps a few other exceptions of less note, the fact has been denied by Catholic writers, ever since the appearance of Mason's work in 1613, when, acording to these latter, it was first publicly asserted, or, at least, first attempted to be proved, by reference to the official record of the act.

Not only has the fact been denied, but the episcopal character of Barlow, the consecrating Prelate on the occasion, has been called in question; and the ordinal of Edward VI., which is said to have been employed, is denied to be a valid form for the communication of the episcopal character. These three points—Parker's consecration at Lambeth,—Barlow's consecration,—and the validity of Edward's ordinal, cover the whole ground, of the present inquiry. In this Chapter I shall confine myself to the examination of the evidence adduced in proof of the Lambeth consecration. In asserting the Lambeth consecration of Parker, Dr. Lingard has distinctly disavowed the intention of thereby

expressing any opinion on the validity of Anglican orders,—a question, which, however necessarily depending on the Lambeth consecration, is not finally determined by the establishment of that fact.

It may, indeed, appear presumptuous, in one so very unfavourably situated as I am for examining the authorities on this subject, to call in question what Dr. Lingard has declared to be sufficiently proved. But as he has given to the public the grounds on which his opinion is founded,—I felt myself free to examine them. This examination discovered to me that the motives of this distinguished writer are substantially the same as those which, advanced by Courayer more than a century ago, failed to convince most Catholic writers, who have written on this subject, since that time. It will not, I trust, be deemed temerity in me, to defend a position which so many learned and venerated men have earnestly maintained. The question must still be considered a legitimate subject for examination, concerning which, whatever be the conclusion at which we may arrive, there is no just motive to suppose an obstinate adhesion to preconceived opinion in those who affirm or deny the fact. I shall, therefore, proceed to lay before the reader the arguments by which the advocates on either side generally maintain their respective opinions.

The proofs adduced to establish the Lambeth consecration of Parker are both numerous and imposing. They may be classed under the following heads: 1st, Royal commissions for his confirmation and consecration, as well as those directed to him, empowering him to confirm and consecrate others. 2d. The archiepiscopal register of Lambeth, and other records in which his consecration is either expressly mentioned or supposed. 3d. His own writings, published and unpublished; and the testimonies of contemporary historians and other writers, who relate the event, or, at least, refer to it.

SECTION I.

ROYAL COMMISSIONS.

We have two commissions for Parker's consecration, purporting to be issued by Queen Elizabeth; the one dated 9th September 1559, and the other on the 6th of the following December.

The see of Canterbury became vacant on the 17th of November 1558, by the death of its last Catholic Archbishop, Cardinal Pole. On the 18th of July, in the following year, a writ authorizing the election of Mathew Parker to the vacant see, was issued; and on the 1st of the following month, he was elected by a portion of the chapter—the major part refusing to attend.*

On the 9th of September following, the Queen issued her commission for the confirmation and consecration of the elect prelate. The commission begins in these words:

Elizabetha, Dei gratia, Angliæ, &c.
Reverendis in Christo Patribus,
Cuthberto episcopo Dunelmensi,
Gilberto Bathoniensi episcopo,
David episcopo Burgi Sancti Petri,
Antonio Landavensi episcopo,
Wilhelmo Barloo episcopo, et
Joanni Scory, episcopo, Salutem.†

(Elizabeth by the grace of God, etc. To the Reverend Fathers in Christ, Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham, Gilbert, Bishop of Bath, David, Bishop of Peterborough, Anthony, Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow, Bishop, and John Scory, Bishop, Health.)

With regard to this commission, it is to be remarked, that it was first brought forward in this controversy, by Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, in his work, entitled, "Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops justified." The authenticity of this Commission is denied by Ward, because it is directed, among others, to three Catholic Bishops, who, he believed, on the authority of Stow, had been deprived of their sees, in the preceding July, in consequence of their refusal to take the Oath of Supremacy. The passage referred to in Stow is not, however, irreconcilable with the commission; for although he states that the Catholic bishops were deprived at an earlier date, there are reasons to believe that his words must be taken with some limitation; and that Elizabeth, who was most anxious that Parker should be consecrated, left as many in the possession of their sees, as might be required for the ceremony. She may have cherished the hope, that the example of severity she had exercised towards the prelates already deposed, would not be without its effect in over-

* Lingard, Vol. VII., 262. † Rymer, xv. 556.

coming whatever religious scruples those she had yet spared, might have to comply with her orders. This is supported by the authority of Larré, a French Huguenot historian, who, in his life of Elizabeth, expressly states, that the prelates named in the commission, were left in their sees :—"probably," says he, "they were permitted to retain them, in the hope that they would consecrate Parker, as was so much desired. They, however, refused to comply with the wishes of the court. This disobedience, combined with what had before occurred, caused them to be deposed shortly afterwards."* The same is also testified by Dr. Bramhall, who attributes the deprivation of three of them, which took place shortly afterwards, to their refusal to consecrate Parker.†

Mason makes no mention whatever of this commission; and there is reason to think that he was not aware of its existence. This circumstance may, probably, have made Ward regard it with suspicion, when adduced by Bramhall.

The statute of 25th Henry VIII. required one archbishop and two bishops, or else four bishops, to assist at a consecration. We accordingly find four bishops, of whose consecration no doubt is entertained, named in this commission. With them are joined Barlow and Scory, who have not, however, any see connected with their names. The same statute required the bishops named in such a commission to carry it into effect, by confirming and consecrating the elect, within twenty days from the time of its being issued; and the penalty of *præmunire* was the punishment for neglect of this order. The object of this regulation was to prevent the possibility of recourse being had to Rome, to obtain confirmation from the Pope. The Bishops of Durham, Bath, and Peterborough refused, and were, consequently, deprived. The Bishop of Landaff did not consecrate Parker, as all admit. He was not, however, deprived. His obsequiousness in taking the oath of Supremacy, appears to have shielded him from the rigorous application of the law.

The grounds alleged by Anglican writers, to explain why this commission was not executed, are so contradictory and unsatisfactory, as to suggest the suspicion that the real difficulty is not avowed.

"Now, if any man," says Dr. Bramhall, "desire a reason, why

* Larre's History of Eliz., p. 24, *apud Hardouin.* † Bramhall, p. 85.

this first commission was not executed, the best account I can give him is this, that it was directed to six bishops without an *Ad minus*,—'or at least four of you,'—so as if any one of the six were sick, or absent, or refused, the rest could not proceed to confirm or consecrate. And that some did refuse I am very apt to believe, because three of them, not long after, were deprived."*

In my former work, I expressed my dissent from the motive here assigned, as insufficient in itself, and not likely to have any weight in the peculiar circumstances in which it is conjectured to have stayed the proceedings of those of the commissioners who were not unwilling to comply with the Royal will. The Canon Law only requires three bishops at the consecration of a bishop. The statute of 25 Henry VIII. c. 20, where there was no Archbishop, required four. Why, it may be asked, did the Queen's officers, on an occasion of acknowledged embarrassment, present a very possible and very probable difficulty to the execution of so important an act as the consecration of the first Archbishop of the Anglican Church—a consecration which, it was well known, was opposed to the sentiments of the few Catholic bishops who had been left in their sees, and who had been thus left with the hope, but without the full and entire expectation, that they would comply with the Queen's desire? Must it not have been foreseen, as, at least, highly probable, that some of them would refuse, especially as the refusal of a single prelate would, in the supposition made by Bramhall, have sufficed to defeat the designs of the court? Mr. Evans tells us, that it is a rule familiar to every lawyer, even to this day, that a special power must be strictly pursued; and, consequently, when given to several, all must unite in its execution, unless the instrument conferring the power provide otherwise. "It behoved Parker," says Mr. Evans, "to see that no just legal exception should exist to his consecration." I admit the rule, within the legitimate sphere of its application, but I deny that the commission in question is included therein, because both the canon and English law would supply the interpretation of whatever might be obscure in its language. It is an admitted principle, that every commission or other public document, is to be interpreted, in the absence of special instructions, according to the nature of the matter to which it refers; and as three, or, at

* Dr. Bramhall, p. 85, quoted by Ward.

most, four bishops, were required by the law, no just or legal exception could have been taken to the act of any four of those named here, who, by virtue of the power given by this commission, should have proceeded to its execution. Nothing can be more unlikely than to suppose that a difficulty of this kind could have been unnecessarily caused, or if by mistake caused, would not at once have been removed by the issuing of a new commission.*

"Why this commission was deferred so long," says Dr. Heylin, "may be made a question; some think it was, that the Queen might satisfy herself, by putting the Church into a posture by her visitation before she passed it over to the care of the bishops; others conceive that she was so enamoured with the title and power of Supreme Governess, that she could not deny herself that contentment in the exercise of it, which the present interval afforded." Heylin himself thinks that the delay was caused by the desire to enjoy the revenues of the vacant sees,†—a supposition which the principles of those engaged in promoting the change in religion would render probable.‡ Courayer, however, assigns the real cause—the difficulty of finding suitable consecrators;§ and few can consider every thing connected with the event, and not adopt this opinion.

The first commission having from whatever cause been found impracticable, a second is said to have been issued on the 6th of December following, directed to Anthony Bishop of Landaff, William Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath, now elect of Chichester,

* Rev. Mr. Waterworth is mistaken in supposing, (Hist. Lect. on the Reformation, pp. 335, 336, American edition,) that a commission to consecrate became void unless executed within the twenty days assigned by the Act of 25th Henry VIII.; and that Kitchin's non-appearance at Parker's consecration may have proceeded, possibly, from an unwillingness on the part of the government to show too much dependence on the Catholic bishops. If so, why was he named in the Second Commission?

† History of Queen Elizabeth, p. 120, ed. 1661.

‡ Referring to this period, Strype says: "And soon after this, there being an avoidance of all or almost all the bishoprics, the queen and her courtiers had a fair opportunity to pick and chuse what houses, lands, and revenues they pleased, belonging to the episcopal sees throughout England, that were the fairest and best, and that had no incumbrance upon them, which, no question, was now done."—Annals, i., 96.

§ "This commission was never executed; for what reason we do not know. There is, indeed, some reason to believe that some of these bishops, continuing Catholics, refused to take their part in this ordination; and that the space of time which passed between the date of the first and second commission, was employed in finding out other bishops to substitute in the room of the former."—Courayer, p. 27.

John Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, now elect of Hereford, Miles Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter, Richard of Bedford, John of Thetford, suffragan bishops, John Bale, Bishop of Ossory. On the 9th of the same month, Parker's election was confirmed by the prelates named in this commission; and a few days after, on the 17th, he received Episcopal consecration at the hands of William Barlow, assisted by John Scory, Miles Coverdale, and John Hodgkins.

It is not easy to reconcile this commission of 6th December, with two other commissions, the authenticity of which is admitted by all, and which appear to suppose that Parker was consecrated before the date of the December commission. One of these commissions was issued on the 20th of October, 1559, and begins thus:—

"The Queen to the Most Reverend Father in Christ, Mathew, Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the Reverend Fathers in Christ, Edmund, Bishop of London, and Richard, Bishop of Ely,—and also to our beloved and trusty counsellors."—In the body of the commission these prelates are mentioned four several times, and always with the title of their sees. Whatever consecration Parker received, he must, at the time of the issuing of this commission, have been considered as consecrated—whether we suppose that in the circumstances, it was found impossible to obtain a regular consecration, and that the bishops of the new church had deemed themselves authorized to consecrate each other, as is said by those who credit the Nag's head story; or that they had agreed to regard the Queen's election as equivalent to consecration, a thing which we have seen was so conformable to the principles which then prevailed. My reasons are:

1. Official documents should be interpreted strictly, and therefore, the persons named in this commission must not have been prelates *elect*, but actually regarded as in full possession of their respective sees. Mr. Evans undervalues this observation, and refers to authorities quoted by Dr. Elrington to shew that, however generally true, it is not universal in its application.* The examples referred to in Rymer, are not to the purpose. They are writs for the restitution of temporalities, in which the epithet 'elect' naturally finds its application; as such a writ is ordinarily the last

* Evans' Essays, p. 44.

of the official acts on occasion of episcopal promotions, until the issuing of which the see is not perfectly filled. He also refers to the commission of 6th December, and asserts, that "unless it be assumed or proved to be forged, it is itself a sufficient reason for considering the words 'archbishop,' and 'bishop,' as used in the commission of 20th October for archbishop and bishop elect; for this is the only way in which the two commissions can be reconciled." I do not assume the forged character of the December commission; but it certainly cannot be appealed to as genuine, in a discussion which is to decide on its title to that character.

2. From the style and title, "Most Reverend Father in Christ," applied to Parker, and "Reverend Fathers in Christ," applied to the others, I infer the consecration of the prelates here mentioned; or their being regarded as having received it. Mr. Evans acknowledges that "the application of these words to unconsecrated persons is certainly unusual." He does not attempt to shew that, in official documents, it is not unprecedented.

3. From the object of the commission I infer that the bishops named in it, must have been such, or considered as such. The famous case of Bonner, who urged the want of the episcopal character in Horn, as a plea for not taking the oath of supremacy, which the latter tendered to him, and the success of that plea, justify me in asserting that Parker, Grindal, and Cox, ought to have been bishops, for the object of this commission. Mr. Evans urges, that Horn tendered the oath under an act of Parliament, whereas Parker was empowered to tender it, by virtue of Letters Patent. But it is easy to see, that the same plea which Bonner opposed to Horn's requirement,—that he was not a bishop, would also avail against Parker and the other bishops named in the commission of 20th October,—namely, that they were not the persons authorized to tender the oath as described in that commission, and therefore might be lawfully rejected.

Besides the commission of 20th October, there is "the Herald's patent, authorizing an addition to his (Parker's) arms, dated Nov. 28, 1559, (ap. Strype, Parker, bk. 1, c. 10) in which he is styled 'Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus,' (Archbishop of Canterbury) without the addition of 'elect.'"* Is it not a most extraordinary thing that such a patent should have issued, full eight days before the issuing of the commission for his consecration?

* Haddan, apud Evans, p. 66.

Mr. Haddan's explanation of the difficulty in these two instances, namely, that these commissions relate to mere civil acts, and, therefore, contain the ordinary title, will scarcely satisfy those who know that in civil, no less than ecclesiastical, documents, an accurate use of language is essential to their validity. That the crown officers would have issued an invalid commission, on so delicate and important a subject as that of the supremacy, may be safely denied; especially as we find a similar commission issued to laymen, in the preceding May. That such an addition would be made to the arms of Parker, after he was consecrated, or when necessity obliged the Queen, through the plenitude of her supremacy, to dispense with the ceremony, is what may be conceived; but when a new commission, as is supposed, was about to issue for his consecration, it looks very unlikely that he would have received such a patent.

The commission of 6th December is likewise open to objection, as inconsistent with that of 9th September. In both we have the names of Kitchin of Landaff, Barlow, and Scory,—one of whom, Landaff, was a validly ordained bishop, as is admitted by all, and all of whom were validly ordained, according to the assertion of the defenders of Anglican orders. Why did not these three bishops consecrate Parker under the commission of September? If Kitchin refused to act under the first commission, why does his name occur in the commission of the 6th of December? They did not, indeed, constitute the number of four, required by the law of Henry VIII. But this legal informality would not have prevented them from validly consecrating the new archbishop; they had no *præmunire* impending over them if they proceeded; and this merely legal defect could have been easily removed by the Queen, by a special writ, with a 'supplying clause,' which would have at once issued, as easily as it is supposed to have been provided for by the corresponding clause of the December commission; or it could have been covered by a subsequent act of parliament, like that which in 1566 extended the cloak of its charity over the naked infancy of the Anglican hierarchy.

Not only may the doubtful character of the December commission be inferred from its incompatibility with the commission of 20th of October, and patent of 28th of November, but it appears to contain intrinsic evidence of fabrication, in the 'supplying' clause, which is in the following words:

"Supplying by our supreme royal authority, from our mere motion and certain knowledge, if anything, either in the things which shall be done by you according to our aforesaid order, or in you, or any of you, in your condition, state, power to do the aforesaid (thing) is wanting, or shall be wanting of those things, which by the statutes of this realm, or by the ecclesiastical laws are in this behalf required, or necessary, the circumstances of the times, and the necessity of the case requiring it."

In no other commission that has reached us, is such a clause contained, and its occurrence here suggests the very difficulty it appears to have been designed to remove. Besides, if the Queen, by her supreme authority, supplied all defects which the law of England, or the ecclesiastical laws might discover in the act commanded thereby to be done—if this were the case, what necessity could there have been for the act of parliament in 1566? Will it be seriously pretended that Elizabeth was so diffident, or so distrustful of her prerogative, as Head of Church and State, to doubt for a moment the fulness of her power to dispense with any mere formality required by the laws of either? or that the judges and juries of the 16th century were so deeply imbued with the principles of later times, as to require the intervention of parliament to sanction and sustain the royal benignity?

I am aware that what is here stated, as a proof of the spurious character of the December commission, is relied on by the writers on the opposite side of the question, as evidence of its authenticity. The following portion of the act of 1566, is supposed by them to contain a reference to this supplying clause of the December commission:

"And, furthermore, for the avoiding of all ambiguities and questions that might be objected against the lawful confirmations, investing, and consecrations of the said archbishops and bishops, Her Highness in her Letters Patent under the great seal of England, directed to any archbishop, bishop, or others for the confirming, investing, and consecrating of any person elected to the office or dignity of any archbishop or bishop, hath not only used such words and sentences as were accustomed to be used by the late King Henry and King Edward, Her Majesty's Father and Brother, in their like Letters Patent, made for such causes: but also hath used and put in Her Majesty's said Letters Patent divers other general words and sentences, whereby her Highness, by her

supreme power and authority, hath dispensed with all causes or doubts of any imperfection or disability, that can or may in any wise be objected against the same, as by Her Majesty's said Letters Patent, remaining of record, more plainly may appear."

These two clauses appear, at first sight, to have a mutual reference. In my former work, relying on the authority of Hardouin,* I stated that such commissions as that of 6th December, were never under the great seal, but always under the privy seal. Mr. Evans shows that this is not the case, by adducing the words of the statute of 25 Henry VIII., which requires that such letters patent should be under the great seal. Hardouin was, most probably, misled by the words, *per breve de priuato sigillo*—"*by mandate under the privy seal,*"—usually found in Rymer at the end of such acts.

Having made this correction, I proceed to state the difficulty which yet remains in supposing the clause of 1566 to refer to the commission of 6th December. This last, as already observed, is the only commission of a similar character that has the 'supplying' clause; whereas the words of the act imply that such a clause was usually inserted in commissions issued during Elizabeth's reign, and addressed to 'any archbishop, bishop, or others'† on such occasions; and, therefore, we should expect to find such clause, at least, in the commissions issued about the supposed time of Parker's consecration, all of which appear to have reached us; and, if not in all, at least in that by which he was ordered to confirm Barlow, as this was a case apparently of as much difficulty as that of Parker himself, whom, a few days before, Barlow is said to have confirmed.

To what letters-patent, then, does the act of parliament refer? Hardouin says:—"The statute of 1566, enacts that no doubt should be entertained of the lawfulness of the ordinations, for which Her Majesty had issued her letters-patent, on account of the defects, faults and imperfections of the persons named; (such as would be the canonical irregularity of illegitimacy, or such like,) seeing that Her Majesty, by virtue of her supreme power,

* Les Lettres Patentes dont le Parlement parle ici, sont scellées du grand sceau d'Angleterre. Les commissions pour consacrer ne sont scellées que du sceau privé. —Refutation de la def., Tom. 1, p. 314. Paris, 1727.

† What can be the meaning of this word "*others*"? Who but archbishops and bishops could, consistently with the canon law and law of the realm, act under such commissions?

had dispensed in such, with all those whom she has named, to episcopal sees; a dispensation contained in her letters-patent, sealed with the great seal of England; which, in this regard, are more ample and detailed than those of Henry VIII., and Edward VI., as might be seen in the records of parliament, where these letters-patent are registered. This is the true meaning of this act. What the queen, by virtue of her supremacy, provided for with more care and diligence than her predecessors, in the aforesaid letters-patent, was the dispensation from the canonical impediments, irregularities and reproaches which on that account might be made to the elected."*

Whether Hardouin be correct or not in this explanation of the difficulty, it is certain, that such dispensations *ad cautelam* are not unfrequent; and if we suppose that they were imparted by a distinct royal act, a supposition by no means improbable, such being then the practice of the Holy See,† we will be able to understand how easily the fabricator of the December commission may, as Hardouin conjectured, have received the idea of the *supplying* clause, from these very words of the statute. That this conjecture is not devoid of probability, may be inferred from the observation already made, that the clause of the act of 1566, recites what was done, not in a single instance alone, but what had been the custom in Her Majesty's reign.

Hardouin is not alone in denying the inference drawn from the language of the act of 1566. Le Quien says: "Although this supplying clause is found in the commission which is now produced for the confirmation and consecration of Parker, this is not a certain proof of the authenticity of the commission. It was easy to compose it on the model of those issued by Elizabeth in the first years of her reign."‡

I shall now propose, in the words of Dr. Lingard, the argument derived from six other commissions issued to Parker, after his consecration: "On the 18th of December, (and the date is remarkable,) the Queen sent to Parker no fewer than six writs addressed to him, under the new style,§ of Mathew, Archbishop

* Hardouin, Tom. 1, p. 313.

† On Cranmer's promotion to the archiepiscopal see, he received several bulls from Rome, among which was one absolving him from all ecclesiastical censures.—See Burnet's History of the Reformation, v. I., p. 128.

‡ Nullité des Ord., Anglic. t. 1, p. 432.

§ The style was not new; it had already been given to him in the commissions of 19th July, 20th October and 28th November. (See Sequel of this chapter.)

of Canterbury, and primate and metropolitan of all England, and directing him to proceed to the confirmation and consecration of six bishops elect for six different sees. This was the first time during the (five) months which had elapsed since his election, that any such writ had been directed to him. What then must have happened, just before the 18th, to entitle him to this new style, and to enable him to confirm and consecrate bishops, which he could not do before? The obvious answer is, that he himself had been consecrated on the 17th. 2d. That on the 21st, he consecrated four new bishops, on the 21st of January, five others, two more on the 2d, and two on the 24th of March. Can we suppose, that so much importance would be attached to consecration given by him if he had received no consecration himself? or, that the new Church would have been left so long without bishops at all, if it had not been thought necessary that he, who was by law to consecrate the others, should previously receive that rite? 3d. That afterward, at the same time with the new prelates, he obtained the restoration of his temporalities, a restoration which was never made till after consecration. 4th. That he not only presided at the convocation, but sat in successive parliaments, which privilege was never allowed to any but consecrated bishops. In my judgment, the comparison of these facts, with those that preceded the 17th of December, forms so strong a case, that I should not hesitate to pronounce in favour of the consecration, if even all direct and positive evidence respecting it had perished."

To the above argument I reply;—First, that there are sufficient reasons to call in question the authenticity of the several writs addressed to Parker. Grindal and Cox, two of the prelates for whose consecration two of these six writs appear to have been issued, are styled "bishops," the one of London, and the other of Ely, in the commission already referred to, issued on the 20th of October preceding. Whatever weight the argument advanced to disprove the commission of 6th of December may have, it is equally applicable to these two writs. Again: John Stow calls Grindal *bishop*, absolutely, without the title of *elect*, at the obsequies of Henry II., King of France, performed at St. Paul's in September, 1559,* just three months before the date assigned for his consecration.

2d. That Parker consecrated others has never been denied; nor

* Dodd, Vol. II., App. p. cclxxxvi.

will it appear extraordinary that one who had not been consecrated should attempt to consecrate others, when we consider the principles regarding consecration avowed by Burnet and Hooker, whenever it might be impossible to receive it from the ordinary source. The desire of the Queen to retain the order of bishops, and the difficulties avowedly met with in effecting that design, may have caused the delay, if delay there was. The Anglican prelates may have been obliged to content themselves with such ordination as they could get, and the necessity of the case may have been deemed a sufficient motive for dispensing with the rite in some instances, while it was observed in others; or causing the embarrassed prelates of the 'new Church,' to cut the Gordian knot, by ordaining one another. Nor was their conduct in this respect without precedent. Did not Luther, a priest, attempt to make Amsdorf a bishop; and, more recently, did not the founder of Methodism, John Wesley, although merely an Anglican presbyter, impose hands on Coke, who is regarded as the first bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church?

3. It is certainly a mistake that the restoration of temporalities was never made till after consecration. Not to mention other authorities, Courayer admits that "the Kings of England often dispensed with this usage."* The defenders of the Lambeth consecration are obliged to make use of this fact, in order to meet an objection, which will hereafter be urged.

4. It would be difficult to prove that a seat in Parliament was never allowed, except to consecrated bishops. In the extraordinary times in which Parker lived, it is obvious that neither a seat in Parliament, nor the presidency of the Convocation, much less the assisting at such assembly, necessarily implies the episcopal consecration in those on whom they were bestowed. The concluding observation of Dr. Lingard would have weight, in the ordinary course of things, and in the absence of all evidence of a contrary character, but in a time of religious revolution—when a whole hierarchy was displaced, and a new one substituted for it, the recognition of Parker as archbishop, may as fairly be attributed to the Queen's anxious desire to preserve the episcopal order, as well as to that necessity, which, as Burnet observes, in reference to similar events, "has no law, but is a law to itself."

* Courayer, p. 54.

The arguments against the authenticity of the December commission, may be thus resumed. There are three commissions in Rymer's collection, subsequent to that of 9th September, in which the vacancy of the See of Canterbury is stated; of 27th September, of 6th, and of 9th October.* There are two such acts between this time and the date of the December commission, namely, that of 20th October, and of 28th November, the style of which would indicate that the see was filled. In view of these facts, how is it possible to regard the December commission with any other feelings than those of suspicion? No proof of Parker's consecration at Lambeth can consequently be derived from the Royal commissions, referred to in the preceding pages. That of 9th September was not executed, as all are agreed; the authenticity of that of 6th December is combated by serious difficulties; and those which are adduced as having been issued immediately after the time assigned for Parker's consecration, are open to exception for the reasons already stated; and even, if regarded as authentic, do not necessarily imply the Lambeth consecration.

SECTION II.

THE LAMBETH REGISTER.

The authenticity of the Lambeth Register, in which Parker's consecration is recorded, appears to be established by arguments of no ordinary plausibility, before examining which, I shall give a translation of the document, whose authenticity is a matter of inquiry.†

"Order of rites and ceremonies observed in consecrating Most Reverend Father in Christ, Mathew Parker, archbishop of Canterbury, in his chapel at his manor of Lambeth, on Sunday the 17th of December, A. D., 1559.

"First the chapel was adorned with tapestry on its eastern side; the floor was covered with scarlet cloth, the table, also for the sacred offices, adorned with tapestry and a cushion, was placed to the east.

"There were, besides, four seats, designed for the four bishops, to whom the duty of consecrating was committed, placed towards the south of the eastern side of the chapel.

* Rymer, xv., 542, 543. † For original, see Appendix, XIII.

"A bench, covered with tapestry, and cushion for the bishops to kneel at, was placed before the seats.

"So also, the seat and kneeling bench covered with tapestry, and a cushion, were placed at the northern part of the same eastern side of the chapel.

"Things being thus arranged, in the morning about five or six o'clock, the archbishop, vested in purple cassock and camaille, (caputium,) enters through the eastern door; four torches preceding and accompanied by four bishops who were to consecrate him, namely, William Barlow, formerly Bishop of Bath and Wells, now Bishop elect of Chichester; John Scory, formerly Bishop of Chichester, now elect of Hereford; Miles Coverdale, formerly Bishop of Exeter, and John Hodgskinne, Suffragan of Bedford. When all, each in his order, had taken the seats prepared for them, morning prayers were recited in a clear voice by Andrew Pierson, the archbishop's chaplain, which being finished, John Scory (of whom we have above spoken,) ascended the pulpit, and thence preached excellently well on the text, '*Seniores ergo qui in vobis sunt, obsecro consenior.* (The elders who are among you,' etc.)

"After the sermon, the archbishop and the other bishops left the chapel to prepare themselves for communion. And soon they return through the northern door to the sacristy, clothed in the following manner. The archbishop had on a linen surplice (as it is called). The bishop elect of Chichester was vested with a silk cope (capa serica,) for officiating (ad sacra peragenda). To whom ministered and afforded their aid two of the archbishop's chaplains, namely, Nicholas Bullingham, archdeacon of Lincoln, and Edmund Gest, archdeacon of Canterbury, also vested in silk copes. The bishop elect of Hereford, and the Suffragan of Bedford, were clad in linen surplices. But Miles Coverdale had only his woollen cassock.

"And thus vested and prepared, they proceed to celebrate the communion, the archbishop remaining on bended knees on the lowest step of the sanctuary, (ad infimum sacelli gradum.)

"At the end of the gospel, the bishop elect of Hereford, and the Suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale (of whom already) brought the archbishop to the bishop elect of Chichester, seated in his chair at the table, (mensa,) saying: 'Reverend Father in God, we bring and present to you this learned and pious man, that

he may be consecrated archbishop.' After saying this, they immediately produced the diploma, or mandate of the queen, for the consecration of the archbishop, which having been read by the Rev. Thomas Yale, Doctor of Laws, the oath of royal supremacy or of maintaining her supreme authority according to the statute, promulgated in the first year of our most serene Queen Elizabeth, was demanded of the said archbishop, which when he, having corporally touched the Holy Gospels, had taken in set words, the bishop elect of Chichester having premised a few words, and invited the people to pray, commenced the litanies, in which the choir responded. Which being finished, after some questions put to the archbishop by the elect of Chichester, and after the prayers and suffrages to God, according to the form of the book published by the authority of parliament, the elect of Chichester and Hereford, and the Suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale having placed their hands on the archbishop, say,* in English, 'Take the Holy Ghost, and remember to stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and of love and of soberness.'

"These words being said, they delivered to him the Holy Bible, saying to him, 'Give heed unto reading, exhortation and doctrine,' etc. After which, the elect of Chichester proceeded to the other parts of the communion service, giving no crozier to the archbishop, with whom (Chichester) communicated, together with the archbishop, the bishops above-named, and also some others.

"Divine service being at length over, the archbishop goes out through the northern door of the east side of the chapel, accompanied by the four bishops who had consecrated him; and immediately, accompanied by the same bishops, return through the same door, clothed with a rochet and camaille of black silk, and had round his neck the usual collar of precious sable skins, (commonly called 'sables.') In the same manner, Chichester and Hereford were each clad in their episcopal habiliments, to wit, a rochet and camaille. Mr. (D.) Coverdale and the Suffragan of Bedford had only cassocks. The archbishop going towards the western door gave respectively to Thomas Doyle, his econome, to John Baker his treasurer, and John Marsh his roll-keeper, (com-

* According to the Ordinal, the consecrating prelate alone says the words which follow.

puto rotulario,) white wands, one to each; thus, in this manner, investing them with their duties and offices.

"These things being thus done in their own order, as already said, the archbishop goes out of the chapel through the eastern door, the more noble of his relations preceding him, the others following him.

"All these things were done and performed in the presence of Edmund Grindall, Bishop elect of London; Richard Cockes, (Cox) elect of Ely; Edwin Sandes, elect of Wigorn; Anthony Huse, principal arm-bearer and first registrar of the aforesaid archbishop; Thomas Argall, arm-bearer, registrar of (Curia,) the Prerogative of Canterbury; Thomas Wellet and John Incent, notary publics, and some others."

This agrees with the original in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

So I attest,

MATHEW WHINN,

Notary Public, and principal Registrar of Cambridge College.

Jan. 8, 1674.

Appended to the original Latin copy of this register, which will be found in the appendix, is a certificate, attesting the belief of those whose names are thereto subscribed, in its authenticity. As those who gave this attestation had to pronounce on the character of a document, which, if genuine, must have been one hundred and fifteen years old when examined by them, and as it is not unreasonable to suppose, from their position and profession, that they were predisposed in its favour, this certificate cannot be considered in any other light than the expression of an opinion, the value of which, as a proof, must necessarily depend on the circumstances in which it was given.

The principal arguments adduced to sustain the genuineness of the register, are, the exact conformity of dates between this event, and a multifarious collection of episcopal acts registered in a folio volume of four hundred and eleven pages, in which it occurs first; which conformity, it is said, would be inconceivable, in the supposition that this entry is a forgery; "while," says Mr. Haddan, "the supposition that the whole book is a forgery, is too monstrous to be seriously entertained." Besides, it is said, these entries in the archiepiscopal register are perfectly conformable to the diocesan

and other registers of the time. It is also confirmed by a large body of extrinsic evidence, which was published to the world in various ways before the end of the sixteenth century.

There can be no doubt that the amount of evidence now produced to support the Lambeth register, is of a most imposing character. Nothing could be more absurd than to reject this evidence, without the strongest motives; and nothing could be more unjust than the attempt to get rid of this proof by ascribing it to a vast system of forgery, unless those who make the assertion were prepared to establish the fact, by distinct and independent arguments. And yet I have no hesitation in avowing my conviction, that this Lambeth register, and the other records referred to in corroboration of its authenticity, are, to say the very least, of so suspicious a character as to render them inadmissible as evidence on the present occasion. I shall state the grave reasons which have induced many of the most learned and exact writers on the subject of Anglican orders to reject them as so many forgeries.

The charge of forgery, which Catholic writers have generally brought against these records, is sustained by both intrinsic and extrinsic evidence. Forgery was, unfortunately, but too common among the party accused of it, to render it doubtful that, *if necessary*, they would have hesitated to employ it on this occasion. A distinguished Protestant divine, who has vindicated the character of Mary, Queen of Scots, from the aspersions cast on it by means of foul, calumnious forgeries, expressly avows the justice of the charge, as preferred against the Reformed. His words are: "Forgery—I blush for the honour of Protestantism while I write it—seems to have been peculiar to the Reformed. I look in vain for one of these accursed outrages of imposition amongst the disciples of Popery."* Again: "Forgery appears to have been the peculiar disease of Protestantism."† That even the public records of the kingdom were not secure from the danger of having forged and interpolated documents foisted into them, in order to acquire a claim to the character of authenticity, from the place in which they might be found, may be seen by a pardon granted to an individual in the reign of James I., of which the following is a part:—

* Vindication of Mary, etc., vol. 3, p. 2, 45, 46. † P. 54.

"We also pardon, remit, and release by these presents to the aforesaid A. B., all and every offences and transgressions by erasing, and interlining any rolls, records, briefs, warrants, recognitions, or other documents of ours, or of any of our predecessors or progenitors whatsoever, in any court or courts of ours, or of any of our predecessors, or our progenitors, done or perpetrated before the aforesaid 20th day of March."*

These extracts are adduced for the purpose of removing from the mind of the reader the impression, which the inexperienced honesty of some might easily admit, that the charge of forgery is an improbable supposition, resorted to for the purpose of evading a testimony which cannot otherwise be refuted. All that I wish the impartial inquirer to remember is, that if either intrinsic or extrinsic proofs of fabrication are found in these documents, they cannot be shielded from the imputation of forgery by their supposed official character. It must be borne in mind, that these records have, from the time when first produced, been rejected as spurious by Catholic writers. This Courayer acknowledges;† but asks upon what ground? Apart from the examination of the motives alleged for such rejection, does not the fact form a very legitimate prejudice against them?

It may not be unnecessary to call to mind the important interests involved in this controversy. The English episcopacy was retained by Elizabeth for State purposes; its superiority over the priesthood —if the word be allowable—of the Anglican Church, was cautiously asserted in an advanced period of her reign. The change that had come over the Establishment in the first eighty years of its existence, has already been dwelt upon. A little more than a century from its origin, it replaced its Presbyterian forms of ordination by others more expressive of the priestly and episcopal character, as will hereafter be shewn. These pretensions to a divine right for episcopacy, and the vast material interests they

* Rymer, xvi., p. 534.—"In the meantime," says a writer who affirms Parker's Lambeth consecration, "it must not be forgotten that the Register, Diary, and *Antiquitates*, appeared about the time that the forgery of documents is said to have been so prevalent as to be made a source of fiscal gain. Pardons were issued at a small charge and ran thus: "Pardonamus falsas fabricationes chartarum, scriptorum, monumentorum ac publicationes eorum."—Waterworth, p. 338, note.

† "Ces registres ont été taxés de fausseté par les Catholiques dès qu 'on les produisit. Mais cela sur quel fondement?—Defense, p. 120, apud Hardouin, p. 87, t. 1.

involved, all depended on the fact, that the first bishops of Elizabeth's reign had been consecrated;—a fact which was denied by the Catholic writers of Elizabeth's days, as we have already seen, and scarcely deemed worthy of being established by those against whom it was alleged. But circumstances had changed, and in the time of James I., whose axiom was, "No bishop, no king," the crown and the prelacy had no object more at heart than to establish a fact, which, forty years before, had been deemed of little or no importance. Whether these records, which were first publicly referred to by Mason, in 1613, were then first composed, or whether, as is not improbable, they date from an earlier period, and were kept in a prudent reserve for times when, having contracted somewhat of the rust of age, they could be more securely produced,* it is not material to inquire. Certain it is, that they were not before publicly appealed to; and the consecrations they record, or suppose, do not appear to have been known to writers, whose silence is a conclusive argument of their unacquaintance with facts having a most important connection with the subjects of which they treated. Mason himself, in producing these records, found it necessary to anticipate the objection which he knew would be urged against them, as heretofore unknown. In the dialogue between Philodox (the Catholic), and Orthodox (the Anglican), we read as follows:

Philodox.—"Surely, (Orthodox,) I cannot but marvel if your extracts be true, how the contrary opinion was so commonly received in the English colleges at Rome and Rheims.

Orthodox.—Truly, (Philodox,) that which a man wisheth, he is willing to believe, and the mind sophisticate with malice, is ready, upon every slight, to imagine the worst, yea, and sometimes to blaze that for certain which hath neither show nor shadow of truth. Yet these vain surmises you receive for oracles, and deliver, one to another, by the holy hand of tradition, wherein you glory as in an unanswerable argument. So did your fellows at Framlingham; so did Hare in the conference with Dr. Rainolds; but when he heard his answer justifying our bishops, by authentical records, he would needs have the whole point left out of the conference, saying, he would not press him with it, and confessed

* Pour les produire, il fallait attendre qu'ils fûssent suffisamment fumés.—Hardouin, Tom. I, p. 105.

he thought no such thing could have been shewed, and that himself had been borne in hand otherwise."*

To the argument derived from the conformity of dates, and a multiplicity of episcopal acts registered in this book, as also in the diocesan registers of the province of Canterbury, it may very reasonably be replied, that this conformity might exist, although the act of Parker's consecration be not genuine; as nothing obliges us to reject the whole register as a fabrication. But then, it is said, the record of Parker's consecration, of which there are said to be two originals, is in the same handwriting with what goes before and follows.† A passage in a letter from an Anglican prelate to Courayer, gave occasion to Le Quien and Hardouin to regard the whole volume as in the same handwriting, and, consequently, as more like a copy made at once, than a register, which had been written at different times during more than fifteen years.‡ Courayer answered, that by the same hand—la mesme main—(the expression used), he did not mean the same handwriting, as if all written by one person, but the same character or style of writing.§

* Pp. 141, 142.—In the margin Mason gives his authorities for this statement: an original letter then in his possession, and a *viva voce* relation by, I believe, Rainolds, to himself. Surely, it cannot be necessary to remark, on the insufficiency of this proof, and on the extreme improbability of Rainolds' acquiescence in Hare's request.

† "Perhaps I ought to explain what is here meant by *two originals*. The transactions recorded in the register were, in the first instance, inscribed on loose sheets; and afterwards, when the papers became sufficiently numerous, were transcribed into a volume. The sheet containing the original memorandum of Parker's consecration, is that which is preserved at Cambridge. The entry on the register at Lambeth is *copied from this*, and among other marks of authenticity, evidently written by the same hand, and with the same ink, as those which precede and follow it."—Tierney, note to Dodd, II. App. cclxxxviii. On this I may remark, that registers are not ordinarily bound *after*, but *before* they are used. It is this circumstance that affords a guarantee of their fidelity.

‡ "And this prelate sent me a certificate in his letter of the 21st Feb., old style 1721–2, that the hand-writing is of the same time and by the same hand, with the rest of the following acts in this register; so that if these first are false, we must presume the same of all the others; and the same must be supposed of those that regard matters purely civil, which is an assertion not to be supported. 'I answer,' says Archbishop Wake, 'that you may depend upon it, that the whole of the entry of Mathew Parker's consecration, with all the incidents relating to it in my registers, are written in the same hand with the other acts of what passed during his archiepiscopal, and all at the time that they were done.'"—Courayer, Williams' translation, p. 38.

§ Une chose pourtant peut arrêter le lecteur comme elle a arrêté les pères Le Quien et Hardouin. M. l'Archevêque de Canterbury m'avait marqué dans une de ses lettres que les actes concernant la consecration de Parker etaient ecrits *de la mesme main*, que les actes de ce qui s'etait fait devant son episcopat, et dans le temps mesme que le tout s'etait fait.—Courayer, apud Hardouin.

This was, evidently, a shift, and Hardouin observes very justly, that if the Register, from beginning to end, is in the same character, it is not easy to say that it is not by the same hand. Besides, it professes to be written by at least two different persons

It is said that the Lambeth register is referred to in the following passage of the Act of 8th of Elizabeth.

"That every thing requisite and material hath been made and done as precisely, and with as great care and diligence, or rather more, as ever the like was done before her majesty's time, as the records of her majesty's said father and brother's time, and also of her *own time*, will more plainly testify and declare."

The records here referred to are those of Parliament itself, and not of Lambeth.

Three registers are produced by Courayer, in corroboration of the authenticity of that of Lambeth,—the register of the Chapter before Parker's promotion; the register of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury before and after that event; and the register of those who died intestate from the date of Parker's confirmation. The register of the chapter was, it is said, providentially saved from fire, by which so many others had been destroyed.*

The register of the Chapter of Canterbury is appealed to as a confirmation of that of Parker. The Chapter appears to have exercised jurisdiction until the 8th of December, and as Parker was confirmed on the 9th, and consecrated on the 17th, this coincidence is a strong confirmation of the fact.

To this it is answered, that the register of the Chapter ought not to have ceased on the 8th of December; that the Chapter retained jurisdiction until the enthronization of Parker, which necessarily followed consecration, and which is only made, as

* J'ai trois registres a produire, qui etablissent ce fait sans replique. Le premier est le registre original du Chapitre de Canterbery, pendant la vacance du siège depuis la mort du Cardinal Polus, jusqu 'a la confirmation de Parker. Ce Registre, compris en un volume in folio, échappé à l'incendie, et aux autres malheurs qui en ont dissipé tant d'autres, porte ce titre. Registrum venerabilium virorum Decani et Capituli Eccl. Cath. and Metropol. Christi Cantuar, sede archiepiscopali ibidem per mortem D. Reginaldi Card. Pole, ultimi archiep. ejusdem vacante, incipiens mense Novembris, anno Dni. 1558. Magistro Antonio Huse, tunc Registrari principali dicti Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis. The following is Hardouin's observation on this singularly fortunate escape—Quoi, lui seul? Le Chapitre de Canterbery n'a point autre registre, que ce volume de la vacance du siège par le décès du Cardinal Pole, jusqu'a la confirmation de Parker? Voilà sans donte un coup de Providence singuliére.

Courayer elsewhere maintains, on the certificate of consecration.* Hence Hardouin concludes that the register of the Chapter is one of the many fabrications connected with the Lambeth consecration.†

The register of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury is next adduced. This register consists, it is said, of two large volumes, from the time of Cardinal Pole to the 9th of December, 1559. In this interval, more than two hundred testaments were registered. The officers of this court consist of a Judge, a Secretary, a Guardian of the Records, and several subaltern officers, all named by the Archbishop of Canterbury, during whose life the proceedings of this court are in his name, or, during the vacancy of the see, in the name of the Chapter. From the 15th of September to the 9th of December, 1559, exclusively, the testaments are ratified in this form: "The foregoing testament was proved—the archiepiscopal see being vacant." This was the style on the 9th of December, as the confirmation of Parker's election was not, as yet, notified to the court: but on the 10th, the form is changed, and the proceedings are in the name of the Archbishop. From the 10th to the 17th of December, the following formula occurs: "Before Master , by the authority of the Most Reverend Father in Christ, Mathew, by Divine Permission Archbishop of Canterbury elect and confirmed."‡

To this Hardouin replies, that the proceedings of the Prerogative Court should not be in the name of the archbishop, until he had sued out the writ for the recovery of his temporalities, which, in the case of Parker, did not take place until the month of March

* Courayer, p. 55, who quotes Bramhall to that effect. "And lastly, the King never receiveth homage for the bishopric, or giveth the temporalities, nor the Dean and Chapter enthrone, till after the consecration."—Bramhall's works, p. 482.

† Hardouin, t. I., p. 145.—"The register of the Chapter of Canterbury, during the vacancy of the Metropolitan see, after Parker's death, has been bound up with the second volume of Parker's register, which was rather slim."—Courayer, p. 225, French work quoted by Hardouin, who makes the following observation on the circumstance: "This shows very clearly that one and the same fabricator (faussaire) made them both; for that of the archbishop, and that of the Chapter, ought to have been bound separately, before any thing was written in either of them, and ought to have been kept in different archives."—P. 377, Tom. 1.

‡ The title of this Register as given by Mr. Evans, App., p. 283, has a blank for the day in December when the court ceased to act in the name of the Chapter, during the vacancy of the see; but that it terminated on the 9th, is evident from the extract given. Why it is not mentioned in the title seems unaccountable. The language of Hardouin would lead me to infer, that the day was mentioned in the title which he had before him.

following; and that, therefore, the register of this court is of the same suspicious character as that of Lambeth.

Another register of the Prerogative Court is adduced to confirm the same event. This register contains the proceedings relative to the goods of those who died intestate, and commences on the 9th of December, the day of Parker's confirmation. This itself, says Hardouin, is a proof of the forged character of this register. "Did the new archbishop send a courier from London to Canterbury, about sixty miles, to announce his future confirmation on the 9th, at the former place?" The jurisdiction of the court, he adds, could not be exercised in the archbishop's name, until after his suing out the writ for the restitution of his temporalities, which was, as already stated, in the March following. All these registers are open to the objection that they recognize the archbishop too soon—before his consecration and installation, up to which time, according to Bramhall, the Chapter's jurisdiction continued, and, consequently, the Chapter's register ought to continue also, and before his recovery of temporalities, which, Hardouin says, is a necessary preliminary to his appointing the officers of the Prerogative Court.

It is, indeed, not a little remarkable, that these registers of the Chapter of Canterbury and of the Prerogative Court, were first published by Courayer; no mention having been made of them either by Mason, in 1613, or by Dr. Bramhall. Not the least extraordinary feature in this controversy, is, that the mysterious silence regarding documentary evidence, when called for in the first fifty years after the supposed consecration of Parker, should be followed by so many registers, etc., the number of which, contrary to the ordinary course of things, appears to increase with time.

The extrinsic evidence adduced to establish the authenticity of the Register, will be examined in detail in the third section of this chapter. It is enough, for the present, to state that there is not a single item of that evidence, so far as it is clear, which is not matter of controversy.

I shall now lay before the reader the arguments of those who reject the record of the Lambeth consecration of Parker in the register as a fabrication. These arguments may be classed under three heads.

1. Intrinsic evidences of fabrication.

2. Facts which are inconsistent with the statement in the Register.

3. Silence regarding the fact recorded, in circumstances which would have naturally called forth a distinct statement of it.

Intrinsic evidences of fabrication.

1. The extreme and unusual minuteness of the record—its affected descriptions of the dress of the prelates; of the doors through which they entered and went forth; of the ornaments of the chapel, even to the cushions of the kneeling benches; its recital of a portion of the ordinal of Edward VI.,—these and several other circumstances that must have struck the attentive reader, while perusing it, suggest the idea of one who was recording an event which he knew would, one day, be matter of sharp controversy, and who endeavoured to screen his work from the imputation of having been made in later times, by this extraordinary circumstantiality of detail. The unusually early hour, about five or six in the morning, and that in December, i. e. about two hours before sunrise, is also worthy of observation. Add to this, what is stated elsewhere, that the Queen deputed six lawyers to attend at the ceremony, and report to her whether all things were rightly done, and that they had no other observation to make in the premises, than what was suggested by the woollen gown worn by Miles Coverdale—who would not use the vestments—which circumstance was not deemed sufficient to invalidate the ceremony. The improbability of all this is evident.

2. There is a great variety among those who quote the Register, as to the number of bishops present on the occasion, and the name of one of them. "This disagreement," says Courayer himself, "is very obvious: for one says that Parker was consecrated by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and John, Suffragan of Dover; Sutcliffe joins to the three first two suffragans. The author of the lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, has but one suffragan with the three bishops, who is Richard, suffragan of Bedford. Mason agrees with the latter as to the number, only he calls the suffragan John. In short the record of the 6th of December, found in Rymer, names seven to whom the mandate for consecration is

addressed—so that we see five different accounts of the same facts."* To this objection Courayer replies that although those who quote, or refer to the Register, vary, the Register is the same, in all the works in which it has appeared. But the writers, whom he quotes, profess to have examined the Register themselves, which seems irreconcilable with the fact that the Register was always the same. Besides, the Register was not published before 1674, long after the times when the foregoing discordant statements were made.†

3. The very title‡ of the Register supplies an argument of its fabrication, in the conclusion of which we read thus: Antonio Huse Armigero *tunc* registrario primario Reverendissimi Patris. (Anthony Huse, Knight, being *then* (i. e. 17th December, 1559) first Registrar of the Most Reverend Father. What is the meaning of the word *tunc*, *then*, if we suppose that this record was, as it professes, written on that same 17th December? The word *then* shews that it was written some time after Anthony Huse had ceased to be Registrar. He died on the 1st of June in the following year. Hence the Register is of a date posterior to that which it exhibits.

4. A circumstance connected with this Register, which of itself is sufficient to cause it to be regarded as of a very suspicious character, is the following note, which occurs on fol. 2, (Evans, p. 64) and in which the death of Anthony Huse, first Registrar of

* Courayer, p. 40.

† "Again, Mason, Sutcliffe, and Butler, do all differ one from another, in naming Parker's consecrators; for Mason says, it was done by Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, and Hodgkins. Sutcliffe says, besides the three first there were three suffragans. Butler says, the suffragan of Dover was one of the consecrators; who, notwithstanding, is not so much as named in the Queen's letters patent for commissionating them to consecrate Parker."—Pp. 187, 188.

‡ Registrum Reverendissimi in Christo Patris et Domini Domini Mathæi Parkeri in Archiepiscopum Cantuariensem per Decanum et Capitulum Ecclesiæ Cathed. et Metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariens prædict. vigore et auctoritate licentiæ Regiæ is in hac parete factæ, primo die mensis Augusti, anno Domini, 1559, electi, et per Reverendos Patres Dominum William Barlow, nuper Bathon. et Wellen. Episcopum, nunc electum Cicestren. Johannem Scory dudum Cicestren. nunc electum Hereforden. Milonem Coverdale quondam Excet. Episcopum, et Johannem Hodgkins Episcopum suffraganeum Bedforden. vigore litterarum commissionalium Regiarum pariter eis directarum, nono die Decembris tunc proximo sequent. confirmati, necnon per ipsos Reverendos Patres auctoritate prædict. 17 die ejusdem mensis Decembris consecrati, Antonio Huse Armigero tunc registrario primario Reverendissimi Patris. In the original record, the former editor of Bramhall's works tells us, that in place of Cicestren. the reading is Licestren.—a mistake inconceivable in any but a mere copyist.—Le Quien, t. I., p. 390.

Parker, who is stated to have died on 1st June, 1560, and that of Parker himself, (17th May,) 1575, are recorded, in a smaller character than that generally used in the book.* Why place these facts in the first part of the book, before the record of Parker's consecration? Courayer said, because a vacant space presented itself. At the end of the second volume of Parker's Register, his death is mentioned; and this is certainly the place where it should be found. Why insert a notice of it in the beginning of the Register? Is it customary to insert the deaths of the Registrars, in the registers they may have kept? Courayer says, "The death of the Registrar, inserted at the beginning, along with that of Parker, proves that this was done by some stranger who meddled with the register after it was composed—qui a manié le registre—because it is not usual to mark the death of the Registrar."† A much more probable supposition, to account for this unusual record, is, that the fabricator of the register was anxious to remove the objection which the similarity of character in the whole register would afford of its fabrication; and that he, therefore, inserted the five lines above copied, in a prominent part of the book, in order to intimate that the register was the work of two Registrars. This accounts for the mention of Parker's death here, so much out of place, particularly as there is a slight discrepancy between the time assigned for his death in the beginning and in the end of the book, 2nd vol. The first makes him die at dawn of day on the 17th May; and the second one, at night, between the hours of nine and eleven of the same day—a discrepancy which might strengthen the inference that the two entries were made by different hands. This, taken in connection with the similarity of the character, is enough to discredit the Register as an authentic document. What stranger would have ever thought of stating

* Primo die mensis Junii, anno Domini, 1560, præfatus Antonius Huse mortem obiit, cui successit Joannes Incent in officio registrarii præd.

Dictus Reverendissimus Pater Mathaeus Archiepiscopus Cantuariensis XVII., die mensis Maji, anno Domini, 1575, in aurora, apud Lambehit mortem obiit et diem clausit extremum.

(On the first of June, A. D., 1560, the before named Anthony Huse died, to whom John Incent succeeded in the office of the aforesaid registrar.

The aforesaid Most Reverend Father Mathew, Archbishop of Canterbury, died at Lambeth, on the 17th of May, 1575, at the dawn of day, the aurora.)

† La mort du Registraire inserée au commencement avec celle de Parker, prouve que tout cela a été mis après coup par quelqu'un qui a manié ces Registres, parceque ce n' est point l'usage de marquer la mort du Registraire.—Courayer, p. 226, apud Hardouin, t. 1, p. 226.

the Registrar's death, and that of Parker, at the same time, and in such a prominent place, especially as fifteen years intervened beteen the two events?

5. In the *significavit* for Parker's consecration, as found in the Register, the name of the suffragan of Bedford—whose true name was John—is called Richard. "In the original (i. e. the Register) it was writ '*Richardo*' first, which has a dash through it, and *Joanni* is writ over, (by the third hand). It stands Richardo in the Roll, and therefore (most probably) in the original patent: whence arises a strong presumption for the genuineness of the Register." Haddan, apud Evans, p. 65. But if, as may have been the case, the copy of the Rolls was made from that of the Register, this coincidence in error affords no argument in favour of the latter's authenticity. Parker's supposed book, *De Antiquitate*, calls him Richard of Bedford. It was very strange that the same error should be found in three documents, which are supposed to be by different hands. Hardouin supposes that the fabricator or fabricators of the Register, confounded Bedford in Lincoln with Thetford in Norwich, and that as the titular bishop of Norwich was Richard—and his suffragan John of Thetford, this latter was called the Suffragan of Richard, and hence the blunder which subsequent inquiry corrected. This mistake of name in an official record is very unusual,* and more calculated to raise doubts than to allay them. John of Thetford, says Courayer, was so strongly in favour of the new Religion that he was deposed by Mary, from the Deanery of Norwich,—and in 1570 was made by Elizabeth bishop of the Isle of Man. Rymer, xv. p. 687. In the writ on this occasion he is called—Venerabilem virum dominum Joannem Salisburgen nuper Suffraganeum Thetford, Decanum Ecclesiæ Cathedralis Norwicensis, *alias in episcopum rite et legitimum ordinatum et consecratum* ad prædictum episcopatum insulæ Sudor, sive de Man,—præsentamus.† Hence it is inferred that he must have been consecrated under Elizabeth, as the Queen would not have spoken of his consecration in 1535, according to the Roman Pontifical, in the above terms.

6. Among the documents connected with the Register, is the

* "By a misnomer not usual in written documents, Hodgkins is called Richard instead of John."—Waterworth, p. 336, *note*, American edition.

† (We present the venerable man, Master John of Salisbury, lately suffragan of Thetford, Dean of the Cathedral Church of Norwich, already rightfully and lawfully consecrated bishop, to the aforesaid bishopric of the Isle of Sudor or of Man.)

certificate, already referred to, wherein six lawyers declare that the queen could give the power, expressed in the commission of 6th December, and that the persons named therein could lawfully execute the same. There is no date to this certificate—an omission which in a document of this character, causes surprise. Neither is there any date to the act of Parker's confirmation, which also contains a very suspicious reference to the "supplying clause of the commission."*

7. There is a delegation to two of his chaplains by the archbishop to take possession in his name, of the spiritualities of the archdiocess. It is dated 2d January, 1559–1560. Two things are observed in this instrument; only one of the chaplains is named; a blank being left for the name of the other. Did not the archbishop know the name of his own chaplain? It is dated from Lambeth, in the diocese of Winchester;† whereas the archiepiscopal palace of Lambeth, although included within the limits of Winchester, is not *of* the diocese of Winchester, but is immediately subject to Canterbury.

8. The election of Parker to the see of Canterbury is said, in the title of the Register, to have taken place on the first of August, pursuant to a writ authorizing such election, which issued on the 18th of the preceding July. Who ever admits the authenticity of the act of 9th September, in which that election is recited, must admit that it occurred at least before this latter date. Mason, who appears to have known nothing of the commission of 9th September, thus stated the election in the first edition of his book, published in 1613: "Now the see of Canterbury remained void until the following December, about which time the dean and chapter having received the *congé d'élire*, elected Master Doctor Parker for their archbishop." In a Latin edition, published shortly after, Mason is stated by Williams, Courayer's translator, to have assigned the election to 1st of August; and this latter writer answers the difficulty presented by the above extract from his English edition, by saying that there is no "reference in the margin to any particular time," which is true, the reference being in the text, "about which time." Mason may, indeed, have fallen into an error, which he subsequently corrected; but

* This is an inconceivable blunder in a document of this character.

† Secundum computationem Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, in Manerio nostro in Lambehith, Winton. Diœc.

as he knew nothing of the earlier commission of 9th September, and as he professed to quote from official records, it cannot but strike the unprejudiced reader as somewhat extraordinary, that, in a work of such importance, concerning a subject that was so much contested, he did not read the title of the Register attentively, or consult the register of Canterbury cathedral (chapter), in both of which the date of Parker's election might have been seen.

9. The Register says, that Parker was elected by the Chapter of Canterbury, "according to the ancient and laudable custom of the aforesaid church, used and observed from former days."* The ancient and laudable custom of electing the bishops, by virtue of the writ, called *congé d'élire*, had been abolished by 25 Henry VIII., repealed by 1 Mary; and again abolished by the 1 Elizabeth. Bishops were elected by the chapter, by virtue of letters patent giving them the liberty of electing *licentiam eligendi* the person named in such letters patent. Mr. Evans seizes on these words, *licentiam eligendi*, which are used in the letters patent, and which are equivalent to the French expression *congé d'élire*, and triumphantly proposes this as an answer to the objection. Were this a correct view of the subject, the ancient custom of electing by virtue of *congé d'élire*, which is acknowledged to have prevailed, need not have been made the subject of three separate acts of Parliament, abolishing it, reviving it, and again abolishing it. There appears sufficient reason to doubt whether a writ of *congé d'élire* was issued in the case of Parker. 1. It is probable that Elizabeth would imitate her brother's example in this respect, and prefer a nomination by letters patent to a process, which, if not a solemn farce, might prove a failure; as the opposition of the greater part of the chapter might be anticipated: and that she did so Sanders expressly states.† She had revived the statute of 1 Edward VI., by which she was empowered to do so. Why not use this power? 2. We have a warrant for the establishment of the court of high commission, dated 19th July, 1559,—the day after the queen is supposed to have issued her writ of *congé d'élire*, —directed, among others, to "The Right Reverend Father in God, Mathew Parker, *nominated* bishop of Canterbury, and Edmund

* Juxta morem antiquum et laudabilem consuetudinem ecclesiæ prædictæ ab antiquo usitatam et observatam.—Mason, lib. 3, p. 126.

† De schismate Angl., lib. 3, p. 347; apud Courayer, p. 34.

Grindal nominated bishop of London."* This is not absolutely inconsistent with a subsequent commission for the consecration of these prelates, as the title "Right Reverend Father in God," as well as the title, 'Bishop of Canterbury,' must be understood to be modified by the word 'nominated,' which excludes election, but shows that consecration had not been as yet received. If I am asked to reconcile this with the commission of 9th September, which I regard as authentic, and which mentions the election by dean and chapter, I can only say, that as that document recites one falsehood, the election of Parker by the dean and chapter, as if no nomination of Parker had proceeded from the crown, and as if Parker had been chosen by a majority, when he was elected by a minority of the chapter,—so it may have been drawn out after some of the older models, and recited an election which never took place. 3. Parker's nomination in July will account for his having possession of Lambeth palace about midsummer, when, as will hereafter appear, Tunstal, deprived bishop of Durham, was committed to his charge, in that archiepiscopal residence. In any supposition that can be made, this warrant for the court of high commission seems incompatible with the election recorded in the Register. The Register, moreover, contradicts itself in the statement, that Parker was elected "according to the ancient and laudable custom from the beginning."

Facts inconsistent with the Register.

1. Parker and others whose consecrations are recorded in this register, receive the title of archbishop and bishop, without any modifying expression in official documents, before the time assigned for their consecration, as shown in the preceding section of this chapter.

2. Hollinshed mentions that Tunstal, bishop of Durham, "was by the noble Queen Elizabeth deprived of his bishopric, etc., and was committed to Mathew Parker, bishop of Canterbury, who used him very favourably, both for the gravity, learning and age of the said Tunstal. But he not long remaining under the ward of the said bishop, did shortly after, the 18th of November, in the year 1559, depart this life at Lambeth."† The historian of

* Cardwell's Documentary Annals, Vol. I. † Hollinshed; apud Ward.

Oxford, Wood, says: "At length being deprived of his bishopric of Durham, about midsummer, 1559, he, (Tunstal,) was then, as it is said, committed to free custody at Lambeth, with Mathew, archbishop of Canterbury; but how that can be, seeing that the said Mathew was not consecrated archbishop till December 17, 1559, I cannot yet perceive. With him also, it is further said, he continued four months, and that dying on the 18th November, 1559, (which was a full month before Dr. Mathew Parker was consecrated,) he was buried at the charge of the said Mathew, in the chancel of the parochial church of Lambeth, in Surrey."* A double inference is derived from what is here stated. Parker is styled bishop, absolutely, and was in possession of Lambeth palace, one of the temporalities of the see. It may indeed be said, that "he was allowed to hold part of his temporalities before consecration;" a solution of the difficulty which would be very legitimately offered, were the fact of consecration positively proved to have taken place after the time referred to; but which has not the same weight, as long as that fact is a matter of controversy.

3. According to Bonner's MS., given by Strype, and referred to in the preceding chapter, this prelate denied that Horn had been consecrated by an archbishop and two bishops, agreeably to the provisions of 25th Henry VIII., c. 20. The Lambeth Register records Horn's consecration by Parker, assisted by three bishops. If both documents be genuine, how reconcile these statements, unless by supposing that Bonner rested his denial of Horn's episcopal character on a fact, which the production of the register would have at once disproved? Why was it not then produced?

4. Godwin, who lived very near the times of Parker and his fellow bishops, and whose work first appeared in 1601, afterwards in an enlarged form in 1615, "in his catalogue of the first bishops, varies from the rest of our writers, both as to days, months and years in regard of several of their consecrations."†

Silence of Contemporary Writers.

Although the argument drawn from the silence of an historian

* Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses*, i., 128.

† Dodd, Vol. II., App., p. cclxxxvi.—"It is to be observed that Mason's registers disagree with those that Godwin used in his catalogue of bishops; sometimes in the day, sometimes in the month, and sometimes in the year, as is manifest in the consecration of Poynet, Ridley, Coverdale, Grindal, Horn, Guest, and Piers, which necessarily proves falsity in one, with suspicion of forgery in both."—Champney.

with regard to contemporary facts, is not, in every case, conclusive, there are circumstances which give it all the weight of positive testimony. John Stow, the author of "the Chronicles," not only lived in Parker's time, and composed the annals or events of his own times, but was particularly favoured by Parker. Now Stow notes down the consecration and enthronization of Cardinal Pole, Parker's immediate predecessor; his reception of the pallium, and the day on which he celebrated his first mass,—but of Parker's consecration, or of the consecration of any of Queen Elizabeth's first bishops, he says not a word, although he mentions the deprivation of the Catholic bishops in the preceding July.* Stow was a Protestant, and, therefore, would not have been silent through prejudice. Parker's consecration was an event every way worthy of notice. Considerable difficulty was experienced about the matter. Two commissions are supposed to have been issued; six lawyers consulted on the legality of the latter one; and a bishop, named in both, in each instance, refused to act. Parker was the connecting link between the old and the new hierarchy, in point of orders, if his supposed consecration be admitted. What event, then, more necessary to be placed on record? Parker was Stow's patron; why, then, did this latter omit all mention of an occurrence which that patron is supposed to have had so much at heart? Parker's consecration was not only important in itself; it was most worthy of remark as to its form: for of sixty-nine archbishops who preceded him in the see of Canterbury, none was ever consecrated in the same manner. In a word, if Parker was consecrated at Lambeth, in the circumstances and according to the form alleged, Stow's silence is most extraordinary.

It is evident, both from the facts adduced in the third chapter of this work, as well as from the title and professed object of Mason's Vindication, that the validity of the English ordinations was denied by several of the greatest names that Catholicity produced in the sixteenth century. Now, in all their works, there is not the slightest allusion to Parker's supposed consecration at Lambeth. Nay, more; the assertion is frequently made, and tauntingly repeated, that the first bishops, namely, Parker, Horn, etc., were made such—*sine ulla ceremonia—without any ceremony;*—an assertion that could not have been made, had it been

* Stow, p. 639.

a matter of public notoriety, that Parker was ordained according to the form prescribed in the Ritual of Edward VI., in the chapel at Lambeth. Had he been so consecrated, the matter must have been notorious: the contrary could never have been supposed, much less repeated, in so many different ways; nor would the Protestant clergy have remained silent during fifty-three years, without any public reference to the Lambeth Register. This argument alone is conclusive evidence that no such register then existed; or that, if it existed, it was not deemed prudent to produce it as an authority.

Mr. Evans says that my observations on the public, and, *therefore*, well known character of the Register, is a pun rather than an argument. He very justly remarks, that few persons examine the authentic documents by which magistrates hold their office, or by which a bishop governs his diocese. There is, however, a marked difference between these illustrations and the case under consideration. Were a magistrate publicly reproached with not possessing any authority to exercise his office; or a bishop repeatedly charged with not having received episcopal consecration, few magistrates or bishops would suffer years to pass by without making a reference to the documents by which they would be able to establish their official character. A public document is not necessarily the subject of perpetual reference, but its existence is always a matter of notoriety, and can at any time be referred to. Some satisfactory reason must, then, be assigned, why the reference to these records was not made prior to the appearance of Mason's work.

In reply to this observation, it is said, that no reference was made to the records before the time assigned, because the fact mentioned in them had not been denied, nor any other account of the consecration of Parker given, before the publication of the Nag's head story, in 1603; that up to that time the ordinations of the Anglican bishops were, indeed, denied by Catholic writers, but solely on grounds having reference rather to the validity of the consecrations in question than to the facts of the case.

I have already shown, in the place before referred to, that not only were the consecrations in question rejected as invalid, but ignored in fact; and this, by the unsuspicious testimony of Mason himself, who was prompted to vindicate his order from the "odious

slanders and calumnies" of the Catholic writers, whose names are given in the title page of this book.

Parker's consecration at Lambeth was not, indeed, directly denied until after the appearance of the work just named, because it was then, for the first time, publicly asserted. That it was, however, ignored before this time, may be inferred from the reproaches made to the first Anglican bishops by their own contemporaries, that they had not received any consecration, as well as from the publication of the Nag's head story in 1603, without any reference to the Lambeth ceremony, which, if then known, would have been referred to by Holliwood as opposed to the relation that he published. Ten years were suffered to elapse after the appearance of this work of Holliwood, (Sacrobosco,) without any public reference to the Lambeth consecration, which was first made by Mason, in 1613. That this was the first public mention made of the event, will be seen in the third section of this chapter, in which the various publications referred to, as of earlier date, will be shown to labour under the same disadvantage as the Register they are brought forward to sustain. During all this time, Mason himself informs us, a cloud involved the origin and character of Anglican orders in most embarrassing obscurity; causing many to decline entering the ministry, and others to return to the ancient faith. Mr. Evans tells us, that Mason's book was the "chief work of a learned man's life;"* a statement which seems extraordinary, when we reflect on the size of the book and the nature of the subject, if, indeed, all was as plain as Mr. Evans must suppose. This gentleman cites the appendix of Mason's book, to show that he had almost finished the composition of his work, and that the reference to the Lambeth Register, which occurs in the body of that work, had been already made and printed before he learned more than the substance of the Nag's head story; and hence, he infers, there can be no rational grounds for supposing Mason guilty of having forged, or of being privy to the forging of the Register. Let the reader compare these assertions with the extract given from the dedication of Mason's work to Archbishop Abbott, on p. 75 of this present volume, and he will see that Mason was induced to undertake

* Essays, p. 132.

this vindication of the Anglican orders with the hope of dispelling the Popish mists — of answering the "odious calumnies and slanders" of Catholic writers. If Mason had never heard a circumstantial account of the Nag's head consecration until the end of his work, what were these mists he wished to disperse?—what the odious calumnies and slanders he was anxious to refute? Can we believe that he never seen Holliwood's book, on a subject so intimately connected with his literary labours and ministerial character, until he had almost finished his labour of love?

Contrast now this real silence and extraordinary forbearance of Mason, during, at least, ten years—from 1603 to 1613—on a subject of such importance in itself, and of such peculiar interest to one who made the investigation of Anglican orders the "chief labour" of his life, with the conduct of Catholic writers on the appearance of Mason's book. At that very time, in the same year, 1613, Fitzherbert, "a man," says Ward, "of great learning and holy life," was engaged in publishing an "*Adjoinder to the Supplement of Father Robert Persons;* in the appendix of which,—for the body of the work was printed before the news of Mason's reference to the Lambeth Register reached Rome, where he resided,—he says: "This adjoinder being printed, it was my chance to understand, that one Mr. Mason hath lately published a book, wherein he pretends to answer the Preface to Father Persons' Discussion, especially concerning one point treated therein, to wit, The Consecration of the first Protestant bishops in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; and further, that he endeavours to prove their consecration by a register, testifying that four bishops consecrated Mr. Parker. Understand, good reader, that this our exception, touching the lawful vocation and consecration of the first Protestant bishops, in the late Queen's days, is not a *new quarrel*, lately raised, but vehemently urged, divers times, heretofore by Catholics, many years ago: yea, in the very beginning of the Queen's reign, as namely, by the learned doctors Harding and Stapleton, against Mr. Jewel and Mr. Horn, whom they pressed mightily with the defect of due vocation and consecration, urging them to prove the same, and to show how and by whom they were made bishops."* "And what, trow ye, was answered

* I cannot let pass this occasion, without directing the reader's attention to the declaration of Fitzherbert, regarding the objections made by the older Catholic writers to the Anglican consecrations. Is it not very likely that he should be

thereto? Were there any bishops named who had consecrated them? Were there any witnesses alleged of their consecration? Was Mr. Mason's Register, or any authentic proof produced, either by Jewel or Horn? No, truly; for as for Mr. Horn, he never replied; and Mr. Jewel, though he took upon him to answer it, yet did it so weakly, coldly, and ambiguously, that he sufficiently fortified and justified his adversaries' objection." So convinced was Fitzherbert that such a Register had never before been referred to, that he seemed to doubt whether it actually existed at the time when Mason quoted it, to the astonishment of the Catholic world; "and therefore," says Champney, who wrote in 1616, "he said in that aforesaid book to this effect, (for his words I have not yet seen,) 'that he would return no small thanks to the man who would assure him that he had seen it.'" This was the very opportunity desired by the advocates of the Lambeth Register; and, accordingly, Abbot, archbishop of Canterbury, to whom Mason had dedicated his work, caused some priests,—Alexander Fayrcloth, and Thomas Lathwait *alias* Scot, Jesuits, and the archpriest Colleton, and Thomas Leake, a secular priest, who were then in prison on account of their religion, to be brought to view the Register in the presence of himself and of six other bishops.*

The result of this examination is variously stated. The advocates of Anglican ordinations assert, that the priests acknowledged the authenticity of the Register; whereas the Catholics state that they merely testified that such a document existed. Both Protestant and Catholic writers agree, that the priests were anxious to have the Register submitted to them a second time; when they might have the opportunity of examining it more conveniently. They accordingly addressed a letter to the archbishop to that effect; but were not able to succeed in getting a second view of the book. Protestant writers say, that the cause of this refusal, was an apprehension lest they should destroy so important a document; and that they were only refused the permission to remove the Register. This can scarcely be believed. The document might have been subjected to a private and most searching investigation, in the presence of some faithful officers, without at all

mistaken on this point, and not a little astonishing, that some modern Catholic writers should prefer to his testimony, the authority of the Protestant Bishop Bramhall, who wrote half a century after, as to the nature of these objections?

* Godwin; De Præsulibus Angliæ.

exposing it to the alleged danger. The Catholic writers assign a more probable reason for the refusal—the fear lest the spurious character of the Register should be detected and exposed.*

If, as is pretended, these priests were satisfied of the authenticity of these records, why renew their application?—and why require the permission to examine the Register, under circumstances more favourable to impartial investigation, than in the presence of an archbishop and six bishops, men who could have been only regarded by these confessors of the faith with feelings akin to those with which the victim regards his oppressors. Does not the importance which was attached to this examination, this array of dignified witnesses, sufficiently attest that the charge of forgery would not have been made, had this register been referred to in any public manner before the appearance of Mason's work? or that, if made, it would have been so notoriously false, as to deserve no notice, much less give occasion to so extraordinary and so solemn an examination of a public document?

Let the reader once more contrast the former silence of Catholic writers regarding the Lambeth consecration, with their instantaneous and indignant protest against a document referred to, now for the first time, in a controversy of fifty years continuance, of great importance, and of more than usual interest. The situation of Mason, chaplain to Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury; the silent change which had come over the Anglican clergy in relation to the nature of their ministerial powers; the coincidence of their newly adopted principles with the maxims which then found favour with the prince; these considerations, joined with those suggested by the denial of the authenticity of those documents from the first moment of their production, form a prejudice against them which no explanation can entirely remove. The observation of Kellison has great weight. "But for your registers, I know

* "Whereas, Mr. (Tho.) Fitzherbert hath lately sent a book from Rome, against the Reverend Bishop of Ely, to which he hath annexed an appendix concerning the records and registers by me produced, desiring that some of their discreet Catholics might view and consider whether they were true or counterfeit; know, therefore, that upon the 12th of this present May, an. 1614, his Grace of Canterbury sent for Mr. Colleton, the archpriest, Leak, a secular priest, and also one Jesuit, called Laithwaite, &c., and shewed unto them the register, and other records of his predecessor, Mathew Parker, which they perused over and over, and found that the said Parker was consecrated in Lambeth Chapel, and not at the Nag's head, in Cheapside, by certain bishops that had been ejected in Queen Mary's reign."—Mem. written by Mr. Mason, in the copy of his book presented to Merton College. —Vindiciæ Ecc. Anglicanæ, c. cclxxxviii.

not where you exhumed them ; they are at least on many accounts suspected by us. For, first, when in the beginning of the new church in England,—as an English writer (Thomas Fitzharding) rightly observes, in his appendix to the 'Supplement,' and the Rev. F. Fitzsimmons, in his most learned '*Britannomachia*,' it was objected that these ministers and bishops, although mitred, were neither truly nor lawfully ordained, they would have easily silenced them, and yet they dared not bring forward those acts, or refer to them (allegare.) This much increases our suspicion, that they were so late produced, after having remained hid so long; although they had been so often called for by our doctors."*

The foregoing considerations appear to me to supply sufficient grounds for rejecting the Lambeth Register, and the other official records adduced as evidence of Parker's consecration at Lambeth, as either fabricated documents, or of so suspicious a character, as to be inadmissible as evidence of the fact they appear to record.

SECTION III.

PARKER'S BOOK, "DE ANTIQUITATE BRITTANNICÆ ECCLESIÆ," AND OTHER WRITINGS.

The authority principally relied upon by the defenders of Anglican orders to sustain the authenticity of the Lambeth Register, is a work ascribed to Parker, bearing the above title. Like all the documentary evidence which is brought forward on the same side, the genuine character of this work is matter of controversy. That it cannot be unhesitatingly relied on as authentic, may be seen by the description given of it by Courayer.† Of this work

* "Examen novæ Reformationis," p. 131.

† "Jocelyn, one of Parker's domestics, is the author, under the direction of Parker, and hence this work is sometimes attributed to Jocelyn, and sometimes to Parker himself. The printing of this work was finished in 1572. The number of copies was not considerable. The first design of Parker, as appears from some of his letters, was only to get as many copies as might serve for his friends and the learned; he was deceived; his views were not properly seconded. Besides the copies he himself distributed to his friends and to the learned, several others got into circulation, and the work became public."—Le Courayer, p. 31 ; apud Hardouin, t. 1, pp. 206–207. "The history of his life, written apparently by the same Jocelyn, to be added to the rest, was printed either at the same time, or a few months later, in the same form. Decorum did not permit this to be circulated during the life-time of the archbishop; the copies were taken but were given only to friends. Hence some copies (of the book) have the life of Parker, and others

two editions are produced, one of London, 1572, and another of Hanover, in Germany, in 1605. This latter is stated, in the title page,* to have been made on that of London, published by John Day, 1572. This title page professes to give the lives of the seventy archbishops of Canterbury; and yet the book does not give the life of Parker, before whom there had been only sixty-nine archbishops. Is the date 1572 a true date? Then, during the life-time of Parker—for he died in 1575—a book was published professing to give his life, both in the above title, as well as in the body of the work, as may be seen in the note below,† and yet did not give it; since the Hanover edition of 1605, professedly taken from that of 1572, does not contain it, although its title page must have been copied from that of 1572. Although the Hanover edition does not contain the life of Parker, it contains tables, wherein his consecration is stated to have taken place on the 17th December, 1559,—place not mentioned. Is it not evident, that the total, or partial fabrication of these two editions, is the

have not. Among those even which have it there is a difference; some bring the life of Parker down to 1572; others to 1573; and others, in fine, to 1574."—Ibid. Bramhall says: "Mathew Parker died May 17th, anno 1575; he printed his book in London, without the author's name."—Apud Evans, p. 71. Wood, the historian of Oxford, thus describes it: "The chief book which he (Parker) wrote and published, (assisted therein, as it is said, by his servant or chaplain, John Josline,) was that entitled, *De Antiquitate Brittannicæ Ecclesiæ, et privilegiis Ecclesiæ Cantuariensis, cum Archiepiscopis ejusdem* 70, *Lond.* 1572–3. Most of the copies of this impression that were commonly sold, conclude with the life of Reynold Pole, Archbishop of Canterbury, who died in 1558. The other copies which remained, and were to be bestowed on public libraries, or else to be given to special friends, had in the year 1574, added to them: 1st. The life of the author, Mathew Parker, containing twenty-nine pages. 2d. A catalogue of such books which he gave to the common library at Cambridge, containing four pages."—"As for the life of the said Mathew Parker, mentioned under the first head, it was, as soon as it peeped into the world, translated into English, under this title, '*The life of the* 70*th Archbishop of Canterbury, presently sitting, Englished,*' &c. *This number of* 70 *is so complete a one, as it is a great pity that there should be one more,* &c. Printed in Holland, in a Dutch character, 1574, in oct. It was translated by a thoro-paced separatist, with very vile notes added in the margin, endeavoring to bring an *odium* on the archbishop, and make him ridiculous, for erecting his monument while he lived."—Wood. Athen. Oxen., vol. i., col. 688, 689; Life of Pole among the Bishops, folio, 2d edition, London, 1721; apud Evans.

* Historia antehac nonnisi simul edita nimirum Londini, in ædibus Johannis Day, anno 1572, nunc vero publici boni ergo recognita et recusa.

† In the life of William Wareham, the sixty-seventh Archbishop of Canterbury, the writer promises to write the life of Mathew Parker,—ut in Mathaei Parker Cantuariensis archiepiscopi vita inferius dicemus.—P. 163. This alone is sufficient to render the work of suspicious authenticity. "Who, asks Hardouin, ever thinks of writing the life of a distinguished man until after his death? The fabricator of this work has evidently betrayed himself."—T. 1, p. 241.

simplest mode of explaining this real contradiction? "The more I reflect on these two editions of the work attributed to Parker," says Le Quien, "my doubts increase in strength and number. In the Hanover edition the life of the first Protestant archbishop is found; but after the leaf which gives the names and arms of all who occupied sees in the two Provinces of England in 1572, is inserted another, of many columns, in which are stated the Universities where these same prelates had studied,—their dioceses, age, time of confirmation and of consecration. There is no mention where the ceremony was made. This kind of Register has been copied from that of Lambeth, but it is a stray leaf (*feüille volante*), which has all the appearance of being interpolated."* "This leaf appears to have been printed after the edition of the book, for the numbers at the top of the two pages are the same as those of the two preceding pages, which shews that they were added after the printing of the book was finished."†

One of two things, either the book was not published in 1572, or the life of Parker had been added to the work, as it originally appeared. This latter supposition is supported by the conclusion of the life of Cardinal Pole,—the archbishop, into whose place Parker was intruded—in the following words, which, as Le Quien remarks, would very appropriately terminate the work—"Quod faxit ille qui quæcunque velit facit, Amen." The reference to Parker, in the life of Wareham, before referred to, as well as the title of the book, and other circumstances connected with it,‡ are calculated to encourage the opinion, that although the book may have been written during Parker's life, it was not published in 1572; and, therefore, must be classed among the fabrications to which the ordination controversy gave rise.

Ward cites a book, printed in 1633, entituled "The judgment of the apostles and of the first ages, etc."—in which the author says, that he examined the original manuscript of the work, *De Antiquitate*, and that he did not find in it any thing of Parker's

* Tom. 1, p. 413.

† Ib. p. 414.—This circumstance is well worthy of observation, as the table in question occurs in the body of the book, and not at the end, as might easily be supposed.

‡ The first letter of the preface is an O, in which are exhibited the arms of Parker. The first letter of the first chapter, T, is similarly ornamented.—Hard. Would the modesty of the archbishop have permitted this? Does not this indirect way of proclaiming him to be the author of the book appear to be somewhat suspicious?

consecration, or any reference to the record of the same. His words are: "In the old manuscript of that book, which I have seen, and diligently examined, there is not any mention or memory at all of such Register or consecration of Mathew Parker, or any one of these intruded Protestant bishops, as the obtruded Register speaks of."* The authors of the treatise *On the nature of Catholic Faith and Heresy*, assert, that one of their friends, who also examined the manuscript of the book, assured them that "there is no mention of any register" therein.†

John Stow, the famous chronicler of those lines, describes Parker, who was his patron, as a favourer of learning and one fond of antiquarian research, to promote which he caused some ancient monuments to be published.‡ He does not, however, say a single word of the work ascribed to Parker, nor does he state that Parker wrote anything relating to antiquity; and this, it is submitted, was the proper place for him to have made mention of such a work, had it been then written.

Howes, the continuator of Stow's annals, who brought them down to 1614, mentions in greater detail than Stow had done, the literary merits of Parker; and states what were the works which this latter either carefully preserved, or caused to be published; namely, Mathew Paris,§ Mathew Florilegus,‖ Thomas Walsingham,¶ and others; but makes no reference whatever to this supposed work *De Antiquitate Brittannicæ Ecclesiæ.* "Would Stow and Howes have omitted all mention of Parker's book,—the one in 1576, the other in 1614,—if they had any knowledge of its existence? If they say nothing, it is because they have nothing to say. Parker's inclination for the study of antiquity, mentioned by Stow, appears to have suggested to the author of the lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, the rather inappropriate title of his book *De Antiquitate Brittannicæ Ecclesiæ*, (*Of the Antiquity of the British Church*,) so that, were it asked, why Stow, while eulogizing Parker, made no mention of this book, it might be supposed to have been included under the title of Antiquities, to which the Archbishop applied himself."**

Hardouin summing up the evidence of fabrication, says: "1. Godwin had not seen the book in 1601, twenty-five years after

* Le Quien, t. p. 414.
† Ibid.
‡ Stow. Annals, p. 1872, ed. 1577.
§ Published London, 1571.
‖ Published 1570.
¶ Published 1574.
** Hardouin.

the death of Parker; and hence it may be fairly inferred that the book was not then in existence. 2. He had not seen it in 1615, when he published his book *De Præsulibus Angliæ*, augmented, as we learn from Wharton. 3. The continuator of John Stow knew nothing of it in 1614. From these facts it may be fairly inferred, that the work was not *published* before 1615, or a short time before. 4. The edition of Hanover, bearing date 1605, is probably antedated, since it was unknown to the continuator of Stow. The motive for antedating this edition, was, that it might be referred to, in favour of the original edition of 1572. Thus this famous book, *De Antiquitate Brittannicæ Ecclesiæ*, as well as the Register, these two pillars of Anglican Episcopacy, fall of themselves."*

But was not the work *De Antiquitate* referred to by various authors, and ascribed to Parker, before the end of the sixteenth century? and is not this a proof of its authenticity more than enough to counterbalance the silence of Stow and his continuator, which is urged, as an argument against it? Not to involve the reader in a long and intricate controversy on this particular point,† it is sufficient to observe that the description of

* Hardouin, t. 1, p. 204.

† Cujas, a celebrated French jurisconsult, is the authority, after the Puritan life, most relied upon to sustain the authenticity of Parker's book; his notice of it is assigned to the year 1589. The passage cited by Courayer is as follows: "Et hoc Ricardi vitium refert Auctor Historiæ Archiepiscoporum Cantuariensium, in medium adducto isto capite. Sunt multa in eo auctore præclara. Nomen ejus ignoratur. Liber tantum extat in Anglia, unde accersitur, et accersitus est magno pretio. —Ad. Tit. XXVIII. *De Appellat. Cap. Qua fronte*, 25. "The passage cited by Cujas," continues Courayer, "is in the London edition, (of Parker's book,) as also in that of Hanover, which had not yet appeared. Here, then, is an unsuspicious evidence of the reality of the edition of 1572." Hardouin thus replies: "Courayer cared not to cite the whole passage, as this would have rendered it evident that the reference (to Parker's book,) was an interpolation. Here it is: 'Ad cap. Qua fronte XXV. Haec constitutio scripta est Ricardo Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi in Anglia, successori illius Thomæ qui dictus est Thomas Becquet; illius, inquam Thomæ, qui, necatus est, et in Martyrum numerum co-optatus, quod tuitio libertatum Ecclesiæ adversus potentiam et impressionem Regis fuisset ei causa necis. Cum vero non eodem modo se strenuum et diligentem præberet intuendis libertatibus adversus Regem, Ricardus, successor ejus, eo quod contra juris ordinem, et contra Pontificalis dignitatis officium, electiones episcoporum confirmaret arbitratu ipsius regis, in cubiculo ejus, in camera regis, nulla habita ante inquisitione morum ejus, qui confirmari volebat; quæ tamen inquisitio omnimodo in confirmationibus episcoporum præcedere debet.—*Cap.* 44 *sup. de elect.* (Et hoc Ricardi vitium, etiam refert Auctor Historiæ Archiepiscoporum Cantuariensium, in medium adducto isto c. Sunt multa in eo auctore præclara; nomen ejus ignoratur, et liber tantum extat in Anglia, unde accersitur et accersitus est magno pretio:) in hoc cap. Romanus Pontifex Alexander Ricardum eo nomine increpat, nec tamen

the work given by the advocates of Anglican ordinations, is perfectly compatible with the fact that the book was in existence, that it was printed, and, in some few instances, cited by writers

propterea illius consultationibus respondet minus.'" "Is it not evident," asks Hardouin, "that what is contained in these two parentheses, has been clumsily interpolated; and this, in order to make a grave professor say, that there is a very rare book, which says the same thing as the Decretal; that the book is to be had only in England, whence it is to be procured, and that it can be procured only at a great price. But what has become of those copies of the edition of 1572, imported into France? Not a single one of them is to be found.

"The oldest edition where this interpolated observation is found, is in our Library (of the Jesuits at Paris.) Its title is: 'Jacobi Cujacii, celeberrim IC. recitationes in II. and IV. libros Decretalium. Nunc primum in lucem edita. A. Dom. 1594.' I have seen another edition, or rather the same, with the single difference of 1595 instead of 1594, on the first page, both—nunc primum in lucem edita—'published for the first time.' This, however, is an antedate, as the year 1572 is an antedate of the book—*De Antiquitate*. The same impostor who had an object to attain in making the interpolation, had also his view in antedating it, and putting words into the mouth of a celebrated Jurisconsult, in Germany, which he could not attribute to him in France. The printer,—whose name, Bernardus Albinus, resembles more an English than a German name—says, in his Dedicatory Epistle, that Budæus died about seventy years before that time—vixit ante annos plus minusve septuaginta Gulielmus Budæus. This *vixit plus minusve*, can only be meant to designate as near as possible the year of Budæus's death. Hence, the false date of this epistle is manifest; and, consequently, of the edition which bears the date of 1594; for Budæus died in 1540, to which, if seventy be added, that brings us to 1610—a time most fruitful in impostures of every kind, and antedated books, contrived by those interested to sustain the new hierarchy, which could only be done by multiplied falsification.

"Furthermore: these lessons or expositions on the 2d, 3d, and 4th books of the Decretals, are not by Cujas. He devoted all his life to the Civil Law. Some notes which he made on a manuscript copy of Collection of Decretals, that belonged to him, and which were printed in 1609, at the end of *Antonius Augustinus*, by Charles Labbé, a celebrated lawyer of Bourges, where Cujas died, fill no more than two pages of corrections of this manuscript. This is all he could find, all that could be found in France, in 1609, of his writings on Canon Law. What some have said, that, in the latter years of his life he applied himself to Canon Law, has no other foundation than these corrections, or these fraudulent editions of Germany.

"These expositions of the Decretals, are not the only works falsely ascribed to Cujas. We have five large volumes in 4to., on the Civil Law, printed in Frankford, with the date 1596 and 1597; and another, entituled *Opus Metadromum*, of 1600. All have been collected by Fabrot; but they are by the same author who wrote the expositions of which we now treat, attributed to Cujas. Five of his most illustrious disciples, Jacques Auguste De Thou, Claude du Puy, Antoine Loysel, Nicolas le Fèvre, and Pierre Pithou, publicly attested, that he had often besought them during life, and at his death made it his last request, not to permit any thing to appear under his name, whether it had been taken down while he spoke in public or not, except what was printed by Nivelle, in 1577, with three books of new Observations, the publication of which, after his death, he confided to his friend, Francis Pithou. All this was on the Civil Law. This attestation is dated Paris, 2d of August, 1594, four years after his death, and is found with the privilege of Henry IV., of the same year, at the beginning of the edition of the works of Cujas, at Hanover, in 1602." Thus far Hardouin, t. 1, pp. 218–226.

in the latter end of the sixteenth, and beginning of the seventeenth, century; and yet that, as far at least as regards Parker's consecration, it is valueless as an authority. I shall establish the truth of this observation by reference to one of those contemporary documents most relied on, to maintain at once the authenticity of the book attributed to Parker, and the consecration of this latter on 17th December, 1559. It is a 'Lyfe' of Parker, which Mr. Haddan thus describes:

"The book meant is a translation, not of the life of Parker in the De Antiq. Brit. Eccl., but of another life of him, (in many passages substantially the same,) contained in a little Latin book, belonging to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, 'called *Historiola*, being a MS., declaring briefly the History of the foundation and the successive masters of that College,' (of which Parker was one;) writ by the archbishop's own directions, about the year 1569, and still preserved with great esteem in the College, (Strype, Parker, book iv. c. 42;—there are two copies of the MS. in C. C. C. Library, the older of them in the hand-writing of Jocelyn;—see Master's Hist. of C. C. C. p. 113, edit. Lamb.) It is entitled, 'The Lyfe of the 70 Archbishop off Canterbury, presentlye sittinge Englished, and to be added to the 69 lately sett forth in Latin;—this numbre off seventy is so compleat a number, as it is a great pitie ther shold be one more; but that as Augustin was the first, so Mathew might be the last, imprinted 1574,' no place or name; and contains,—1. 'Historiola, or a Little Story of the Actes and Life of Mathew, now Archbishoppe of Canterb.' 2, a virulent invective against the De Antiq. Brit. Eccl., (of which the author had seen a copy without the life of Parker,) headed, 'To the Christian Reader, peace with CHRISTE and war with Antechriste,'—it is a little duodecimo pamphlet in an old character, (Dutch, according to Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. ii. c. 983, ed. Bliss.)"

I cannot do better than translate the observations of Le Quien, who, after referring to it in the body of his work, procured a copy of this Puritan life, perhaps the only copy then existing in France, from the library of the Count De Seignelai. Although the inspection of the work discovered to him, that he had fallen into some mistakes in his former description of it, it but strengthened his

* Evans, p. 72.

conviction that neither it, nor the book *De Antiquitate*, could be adduced as evidence of Parker's consecration.

"This life of Parker which, as already said, was intended to form a part of the history of the University of Cambridge, was afterwards destined to be placed at the end of the book *De Antiquitate*, printed some short time before, as the title expressly states. 'The life of the 70 Archbishop of Canterbury, presentlye sittinge, Englished, and to be added to the 69, lately sette forth in Latin.' But it was soon after reviewed and corrected, and an English edition of it was published, from which Mason has given the extract, regarding the consecration of this prelate, (Parker,) in his first work, '*On the consecration of bishops in the Church of England.*'* He testifies that he had found a copy of it in the library at Oxford, which, consequently, must be that mentioned on page 35, part 2, of the Bodleian library. Although this edition is dated in 1574, the extract from it in Mason, which Champney has done into Latin,† differs too much from what we read in the edition of the 'Puritan,' to justify the supposition that it was taken from it.

"The Latin life of Parker which has been added to some copies of the London edition of the work on 'British Antiquities,' is, as I have been told by those who have seen it, very different from the other two, and much larger. It contains the narrative of the consecration of this Protestant primate; it states the year and day, as also the day of his election to the see of Canterbury, and the names of the bishops who consecrated him, circumstances not mentioned in Mason's extract, or in the 'Puritan life.' Hence it is natural to conclude that this Latin life was written a short time before the death of Parker, (17th May, 1575,) or, what appears nearer the truth, after his death; for this long life was but sketched in the two preceding editions, and there is nothing to show that it was printed before May, 1575.

"However that may have been, the Anglicans acknowledge that a very few copies of this, as well as of the preceding, editions, were struck off; and hence, they remained in obscurity until the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Mason cited the second and last (third) one. They were unknown not only to the Catholic writers of that time, but also to the Protestant Whitaker,

* P. 131. † De Vocatione, p. 478.

Sutcliffe, Butler, who never cited them to refute the objections made by Stapleton, Campian, Durey, Kellison, and the other Catholic controversialists against the ordinations of their first bishops.

"Everything, then, obliges us to regard this life, composed at first under the eyes of Parker, so often changed, and so successfully concealed,† except from some few friends on whom reliance could be placed, as a work of mysterious obscurity.* This leader of the Anglican reformation under Elizabeth, may have prepared it himself, in order to conceal from posterity the shame of his intrusion into the first see of England, which was ascertained, as Stapleton assures us, to have been effected without *any* imposition of hands. Hence we are justified in calling into question the statements of such suspicious documents, especially as we know them to be contrary to the testimony of many contemporary writers, who spoke openly, and not as if afraid of the sound of their own voice. It is not improbable that Parker and his brethren may have made some arrangement, which, in after times might be opposed to the troublesome objections of Catholic writers; and may have assigned his consecration and that of his colleagues, to certain days which they found most convenient. To produce the manuscript of Parker, to quote some leaves which he got printed towards the end of his life, is to adduce the testimony of a man in his own cause.

"Moreover, according to the 'Puritan life,' the ceremony was not according to the ordinal of Edward VI., and it consisted in the simple installation of Parker into the see itself, (episcopal throne) at Canterbury, and not in the domestic chapel of Lambeth, (sixty miles from the former place.) His words are:—"The other archbishops from Austin having entered by force of bulls, and with the consent of the Pope from Rome, he (Parker) was consecrated without them, and without any of those old and impertinent ceremonies of vestments, like those of Aaron, without gloves, sandals, shoes, mitre and pallium; but modestly and religiously, conformably to the purity of the Gospel. Four bishops having been appointed according to law, to perform this ceremony, they placed him in his throne, after he had promised to acquit himself of the duty of pastor, as it is prescribed in the

* Toujours tenuë cachée. . . † Œuvre de Tenebres.

Gospel. Neither did he conduct himself in a negligent manner on that solemn and joyful day. He appeared in a decent dress, suitable for a bishop. The church ministers with the people recited the prayers; a bishop who had been a friar, and had taught theology, preached on the duty of a pastor towards his flock, and of the flock to the pastor. After the sermon, they partook of the spiritual banquet, and ended with a fervent prayer to God, that the office which the clergy had imposed on him might serve to the glory of the Divine Majesty, the salvation of christian people, and the favourable testimony of his own conscience, of having fulfilled his duty when he will go to the Lord to whom he is devoted."*

"There are many things in this narrative which are not easily reconciled with the relation of the Lambeth Register, or the ordinal of Edward VI. In that relation, (p. 109,) which its affected minuteness renders suspicious, there is no mention of the enthronization of Parker, a very ancient ceremony in the Christian Church, which the ordinal of Edward omits. The Register contains two documents, one of which states, that Parker should have been installed in person, and that he was installed by proxy. The relation (Lambeth record) states that, after morning prayers, John Scory, elect of Hereford, preached, and, immediately after the sermon, the prelates retired to the sacristy to put on their vestments, in order to begin the ceremony of consecration, which ended with the communion; and in the extract which I have just inserted from the first life of Parker, probably written by himself, the sermon followed the installation. It is added that, immediately after the sermon, the assembly received communion; whereas, according to the Lambeth Register, the archbishop, the other

* The above passage is translated from the French translation of the original English. This description, so different from the minute and affected detail of the same event, mentioned in the Register, suggests the idea that the new bishops were at first inaugurated, or installed, by some such ceremony as that described in the text, and this inauguration may have taken place on the days subsequently assigned for their consecration. Dr. Humphreys, in his biographical sketch of Jewel, prefixed to a work published in 1573, and, as already said, dedicated to Parker and Sandys, says, speaking of Jewel: Devonia aliisque partibus ita perlustratis, Januarii vicesimo primo die, A. D. 1549; (it should be 1559.)—Episcopus Sarisburiensis *inauguratur*. (Having passed through Devonshire and other districts, he was *inaugurated* Bishop of Salisbury on the 21st January, A. D. 1559.) The Register states that Jewel was consecrated on this day. Is it not very remarkable that Humphreys—an ecclesiastical writer—should have used the word "*inaugurate*" to express the consecration ceremony?

bishops, and only some of the assistants received the sacrament. The long Latin life states that a great number of persons of distinction received communion,—Eucharistiæ a frequenti gravissimorum hominum coetu perceptione. The second life, quoted by Mason, also places the sermon after the consecration of the archbishop, and the communion after the sermon.

"I have shown that the long Latin life of Parker could not have been printed in 1572, since it is later than the 'Puritan life' printed two years after, and that it is later than the English edition, which is of the same year.

"These reflections render more and more uncertain in what year these few leaves were printed, in order to add them to some copies of the work on British Antiquities, which were not brought forward for a long time afterwards. Since they must be later than 1573, and even 1574, it cannot be ascertained that they were printed in Parker's life-time. This justifies us in saying that they were not printed until after the fabrication of the Register, which is cited in the margin, although, it is said, that there is no mention of it in the original manuscript. It has been abundantly proved that the Register is not authentic; that it has been composed after the death of Parker, and, consequently, that it is to be regarded as supposititious. It has just been shown that the Latin life of Parker, which, in the margin, affects to cite the life of Parker, is not better authenticated. Whatever may be said in support of these documents, is refuted by opposing testimony, which can never be so far weakened as to give entire certainty to the contested fact."*

That in 1724, twenty-one copies of the book *De Antiq*, thirteen of which contained the life of Parker, and some of them with manuscript notes and manuscript presentation addresses, were found in different libraries in England, is not denied. The existence of the book is not called in question; its date is the matter in dispute. Hardouin very properly rejects the proofs derived from presentation copies, as also from a journal and letters attributed to Parker. When these proofs were first produced, it was not possible to ascertain whether these manuscripts and memoranda had been actually written by Parker, or others whose names were mentioned in them. We are not, indeed, able to prove them to be fabrications, but we cannot be required to consider them as

* Le Quien, t. 1, p. viii.–xvii; additions.

proofs. We must always bear in mind that we have to ascertain the true character of books and documents, which, from the observations already made, are of, at best, a suspicious character, and have been repeatedly rejected by many learned men as parts of an extensive system of forgery.

The following passage from Sutcliffe is given by Dr. Elrington, who says that the work from which it is taken, was published in 1591: "Bishop Parker was consecrated by imposition of hands, by Bishop Barlow, Bishop Coverdale, Bishop Scory, and several suffragans mentioned in the act of consecration." Had Sutcliffe seen the record? If so, how account for the mistake he makes, assigning "several suffragans" as taking part in the ceremony, whereas one only is said to have assisted on the occasion? It is not improbable that the record was in existence at the time he wrote; and although he does not appear to have seen it, he may have heard of it. Sutcliffe's reference to the act of consecration is not so clear as was that of Mason, twenty-two years afterwards; and hence the one remained unnoticed, while the other excited an immediate and universal outcry among the Catholic writers.

Camden, in his history of the reign of Elizabeth, gives, it is said, an account of Parker's consecration on 17th December, 1559. This book, however, was published in 1615, after Mason. But Mr. Evans urges that Camden wrote, as he tells us, at the request of Lord Burleigh, who died in 1597; and it is to be observed that the account of the consecration is in the very beginning of his book, and must have been written, although not printed, before Mason's work. Besides, in another work, printed in 1586, Camden refers to the *Antiquitates Brittannicæ*, perhaps written by Parker, in which the fact is mentioned.

It is only necessary to say, in reply, that the "Annals" were first published in 1615, two years after Mason's work. At whose request it was written, or what part may have been prepared long before its publication, need not be inquired. No proof can be adduced that the notice of Parker's supposed consecration was written six months before the publication of the work, whether it occurs at the beginning or at the end of it.

But it is said, Stow, whose silence is relied on in disproof of Parker's consecration, mentions that of Grindal, on the 21st of December, 1559—the day on which the Register records it. It is true, that, in his "Survey of London," published, as appears by

the title-page of the edition of 1633,* first, I believe, in 1598, then *augmented* by A. M. in 1605 and 1618,—after Stow's death, Grindal's consecration is assigned to the above date. Had we the original edition published during the author's life, and before it was *augmented*, we might be able to form a more satisfactory opinion than we can from an edition published after his death, and when his silence had been used by several Catholic writers as an argument against the Lambeth Register. In his chronicle, Stow styles Grindal Bishop of London, without adding the word "elect," which, in the same paragraph, he applies to Parker, Barlow, and Scory, in his description of the obsequies of Henry II. at St. Paul's, on the 9th September, 1559. He narrates the proceedings of that day in a manner to shew that Grindal was then in possession of the palace of the Bishop of London—a portion of his temporalities as such, which, we are told, are never given before consecration. Is not this an evident proof that Grindal's consecration, mentioned in the Survey, must be ranked among the "augmentations" of the original work?

I shall conclude this tedious investigation with the remark, that, were the authenticity of the Register, etc., as certain as it is questionable, the advocates of Anglican orders would have but little reason to exult. The "supplying" clause of the December Commission will ever be a monument of some mysterious defect, in those who are regarded as the connecting link between the old hierarchy and that which succeeded it in England. That this defect was of no ordinary character, may be inferred from the importance given to it by the words of the Commission—"the necessity of the case so requiring it,—"† and the consultation of canonists held on the occasion. And as far as such defect was not a mere legal informality, there are but few at the present day who will have their doubts removed, or their apprehensions quieted, by the power of the queen to supply all defects, and ratify every incompetency. Hence the view most favourable to Anglican orders which can be taken of this vexed question, must present to every reflecting mind a difficulty scarcely less embarrassing than the denial of the fact. In his Documentary Annals of the English Reformed Church, Dr. Cardwell, with more zeal for the honour of his order than fair dealing or prudence would

* See this edition in the Loganian Library, Philadelphia.
† Temporis ratione et rerum necessitate id postulante.

sanction, has entirely omitted the "supplying" clause in the Commission of 6th December—an omission which, in the circumstances, cannot but be regarded as deeply significant of its real import.*

CHAPTER V.

BARLOW'S CONSECRATION.

The principal question now to be examined is, was Barlow, Parker's alleged consecrator, himself consecrated? It scarcely need be remarked, that, admitting the truth of the Lambeth consecration, Parker's episcopal character depends on the fact, that a duly consecrated bishop officiated as consecrator on the occasion. Whatever doubt or uncertainty may be entertained regarding the episcopal character of Barlow, who is said to have been the consecrating prelate, must necessarily extend to that of Parker.

The defenders of Anglican ordinations very generally deny that, the question of Parker's consecration depends, as far as the consecrating prelate is concerned, on the sole fact of Barlow's episcopal character. Those who assisted him were, it is said, duly consecrated bishops; and from the peculiar character of the English rite of consecration, it is asserted, the defect of the episcopal character in one—even if that one were the principal consecrator—would be supplied by those invested with it, and who joined with such principal consecrator in the act. Such a principle, however, is not only contradicted by the practice of the Church, and the consent of all writers on the subject, who have not written with a view to the present, or some similar case; but is confuted

* *Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England.* Oxford, 1839. Vol. 1, p. 242.—The editor of this collection professes to have collated, in many instances, the documents he publishes, with their originals. In the title of the form of ceremonies used at Parker's consecration, (p. 243,) it is said to have taken place, *die dominico, id est, decimo sexto mensis Decembris*, 1559, (on Sunday, that is, the sixteenth of December, 1559.) Is it so in the original? If so, it is a blunder that destroys the character of the document in which it is found. The 16th of Dec., 1559, was on Saturday. And yet, the copy of this identical document, published in 1674, with attestations of its being conformable to the original, and all subsequent editions of it, have Sunday, the 17th Dec.

by the obvious principle, that those who are employed as assistants to a principal agent, may *aid* such agent in what he *does*, but cannon aid him in what he *does not*, or is incapable of doing. As the ratification of an act, invalid from the beginning, from a defect of power in the agent, cannot give it validity, so neither can the assistance and co-operation of duly consecrated bishops impart the episcopal character, when the principal consecrator is incapable of conferring it. It may be, moreover, observed that according to the ordinal of Edward VI., the presiding or consecrating prelate alone pronounces the words, "Take the Holy Ghost, &c.—that 'form,' by which the episcopal character is believed to be imparted, as the following rubric shows:

"Then the Presiding Bishop, and Bishops present, shall lay their hands upon the head of the elected Bishop kneeling before them, *the Presiding Bishop saying*,*

"'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, &c.'

"Then *the Presiding Bishop shall deliver him* the Bible, saying, 'Give heed unto reading, &c.'"

Hence the peculiar form of Edward's ordinal is vainly appealed to, as the Presiding Bishop alone does that by which the elect receives the episcopal character. Besides, it can easily be shown, that Barlow's assistants, if consecrated at all, had been consecrated according to the ordinal of Edward VI., the insufficiency of which will be established in the following chapter.

No record of Barlow's consecration has been found; but it is asserted, 1. That he was regarded by his contemporaries as a bishop; 2. That he occupied two or three different sees in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.; 3. That he sat in Parliament as bishop; 4. That he assisted at several convocations as bishop; and was among the bishops to whom were proposed the questions referred to in the 2d chapter of this work; 5. And that his name occurs among the assisting bishops at a consecration held in 1541, not to speak of his being named in the two commissions that issued for Parker's consecration. The indirect evidence afforded by all these circumstances must, it is maintained, be held as conclusive as any that positive testimony could supply.

* In the record of the ceremony at Lambeth, *all* the bishops are represented as saying—inquiunt—these words. If they followed Edward's ordinal, Barlow alone used them. This discrepancy is the more remarkable, as the record is so extremely minute in its details.

The following view of the nature and efficacy of inferential evidence is adduced by Mr. Evans, and admitted by me, as perfectly reasonable and satisfactory.

"Where direct evidence of the fact in dispute is wanting, the more the jury can see of the surrounding facts and circumstances, the more correct their judgment is likely to be. It is possible that some circumstances may be misrepresented, or acted with a view to deceive; but the whole context of circumstances cannot be fabricated: the false invention must have its boundaries, where it may be compared with the truth; and therefore, the more extensive the view of the jury is of all the minute circumstances of the transaction, the more likely will they be to arrive at a true conclusion. Truth is necessarily consistent with itself; in other words, all facts which really did happen, did actually consist and agree with each other. If then the circumstances of the case, as detailed in evidence, are incongruous and inconsistent, that inconsistency must have arisen either from mistake, from wilful misrepresentation, or from the correct representation of facts prepared and acted with a view to deceive. From whatever source the inconsistency may arise, it is easy to see, that the greater the number of the circumstances is which are exhibited to the jury, the more likely will it be that the truth will prevail; since the stronger and more numerous will be the circumstances on the side of truth. It will be supported by facts, the effect of which no human sagacity could have foreseen, and which are therefore beyond the reach of suspicion; whilst, on the other hand, fraudulent evidence must, necessarily, either be confined to a few facts, or be very open to detection, by affording too many opportunities of comparing it with that which is known to be true. Fabricated facts must, in their very nature, be such as are likely to become material. Hence it has frequently been said, that a well supported and consistent body of circumstantial evidence is sometimes stronger than even direct evidence of a fact; that is, the degree of uncertainty which arises from a doubt as to the credibility of direct witnesses, may exceed that which arises upon the question, whether a proper inference has been made from facts well ascertained. A witness may have been suborned to give a false account of a transaction to which he alone was privy, and the whole rests upon the degree of credit to be attached to the veracity of the individual; but where a greater number of independent facts conspire to the same

conclusion, and are supported by a number of unconnected witnesses, the degree of credibility to be attached to the evidence increases in a very high proportion, arising from the improbability that all these witnesses should be mistaken or perjured, and that all the circumstances should have happened contrary to the usual and ordinary course of human affairs."—*Starkie's Practical Treatise on the Law of Evidence. Part I. sect. ix. vol i. pp.* 19, 20.

Inferential evidence is, then, equally satisfactory as positive proof; and the only point to be determined, is, whether or not it exists in the case of Barlow, i. e. whether or not the circumstances connected with his history are such as necessarily to imply his consecration. A very imposing array of facts is produced to shew that Barlow was held to be a bishop, but facts equally certain are urged by those who deny that he was so considered; and the arguments which appear to establish the fact, are far from being conclusive. Let me define exactly my position in this part of this intricate controversy. I do not undertake to prove that Barlow was not regarded as a duly consecrated bishop by his contemporaries; but merely to shew that the fact is not satisfactorily established, and that it is yet matter of legitimate doubt.

Mr. Evans has devoted a chapter to the 'Proofs' of Barlow's episcopal character, which I shall now pass in review. The first proof adduced to establish Barlow's consecration, is the *significavit*, dated 20th April, 1536, by which the King intimates to the Archbishop his approval of "an election lately made in the Cathedral Church of St. David; vacant by the death of Richard Rawlins, the last bishop there, of the Reverend Father in Christ, Sir William Barlow, S. T. P., THEN BISHOP of St. Asaph." Here, says Mr. Evans, we have a direct proof that, at the time of his election to the see of St. David's, Barlow was Bishop of St. Asaph's; to which see he had been elected some time in February, 1535-6, i. e. about two months before the date of his writ.

Again:—In the confirmation of the election in Cranmer's Register, Barlow is called "the Reverend Father in Christ, William Barlow, Bishop of St. Asaph, and Commendator of the monastery of Bisham." From the language used in these two documents, Mr. Evans infers that I, at least, must allow Barlow's episcopal character; as I have argued in disproof of Parker's consecration, from the use of similar language in the commission of 20th October, 1559.

But Mr. Evans is mistaken. The question is not now precisely what I must admit, or what I may deny; but whether the language of these documents *proves* that Barlow was consecrated bishop for the see of St. Asaph. If it does, then Mr. Evans must admit that Parker was Archbishop of Canterbury, full two months before the date assigned for his consecration! Hence my admission would only prove the necessity of consistency; but, in Mr. Evans' principles, would not establish the consecration of Barlow.

Mr. Evans' argument is not, however, what he supposes it to be against me, an *argumentum ad hominem;* because I deny the authenticity of the two documents he produces, or, at least, I shew the inconclusiveness of the inference he draws from them, by establishing—and that, by arguments entirely independent of any reference to these documents—the fact, that Barlow was never more than bishop elect of St. Asaph. Hence I infer that all documents in which he is styled bishop, without any modification, are, of, at least, doubtful authenticity, or must be understood so as not to be irreconcilable with the facts which I adduce. That Barlow was never more than bishop elect of St. Asaph, I prove, both by the admission of advocates of Anglican orders, and by documents, the authenticity of which Mr. Evans admits.

When Courayer was composing his work, he was aided by some English correspondents, extracts from whose Latin letters he has printed in the appendix to it. The writers are unsuspicious witnesses, who, unquestionably, had opportunities of acquiring correct information. One of them says:—"I have observed only three bishops, within the last two hundred years, who have been translated to new sees, without having been consecrated for those to which they were first elected. Of these, THIS BARLOW OF WHOM THERE IS QUESTION IS THE FIRST."*

Again, another extract in the same Appendix, contains the following conjecture, and the explicit avowal that Barlow could not justly (properly) be called Bishop of St. Asaphs. "Barlow was confirmed Bishop of St. Asaph, on the 23d of February, 1535. He was then absent from the city, being occupied in the King's business, out of the kingdom. Hence his confirmation was made by means of a proxy, and he himself PROBABLY consecrated in the

* Tres solummodo episcopos observavi, qui, his ducentis annis proxime elapsis, ad secundas sedes transierint, antequam ad priores *consecrati* fuissent. Horum primus est Barlovius ille de quo hic agitur.—Appendix to Courayer, p. 389.

country, by virtue of the archbishop's commission."* "Hence, although we know with certainty that he was confirmed, and, *as it is reasonable to suppose*—(ut par est credere)—also consecrated, yet, with regard to the see of St. Asaph, he could not properly (*jure*) be said to be more than elect, because neither his confirmation nor his consecration had been certified in due form of law to the chapter thereof."† The diocesan register of St. Asaph contains no entry of any episcopal act done by him.

A manuscript entitled "Speculum Protestantismi," written by a grand-nephew of Barlow, who had become a Catholic, says, "that he never was Bishop of St. Asaph's." And John Bale places him FIRST at St. David's before his translation to Bath.‡ Lord Herbert in noticing his mission to Scotland, expressly calls him Bishop ELECT of St. Asaph's. All that has been hitherto said,

* Barlovius confirmatus fuit episcopus Assavensis, 23 die Feb., anno, 1535. Absens tum erat ab urbe, in regiis negotiis extra regnum occupatus. Hinc confirmatio ejus per procuratorem facta, et ipse *verisimiliter* vigore commissionis archiepiscopalis ruri consecratus.—P. 376.

† Sequitur eum quantumvis reipsa ut certo scimus, confirmatum, et, ut par est credere, etiam consecratum, respectu tamen sedis Assavensis, nihil amplius quam episcopum electum jure dici potuisse, utpote cujus nec confirmatio nec consecratio illius ecclesiæ capitulo, in debita juris forma, fuisset certificata.—Appendix to Courayer, p. 377.

In my former work this extract was thus given in the text: "Hence, although we know with certainty that he was confirmed, and, *as it is reasonable to suppose*, also consecrated, yet nothing further appears with regard to the see of St. Asaph."

In the note: "Sequitur eum quantumvis reipsa, ut certo scimus, confirmatum, et. ut *par est credere*—etiam consecratum; respectu tamen sedis Assavensis, nihil amplius.—App. to Courayer, p. 377."

I am unable to explain how it happened, that I inserted an obviously unfinished sentence—as is that in Latin—and translated it as if it were a perfect one: yet it must be clear that it was an unintentional mistake; and did not result from any wish to act unfairly, as Mr. Evans hesitates not to insinuate. This is evident from the exactness of my reference; from the obviously unfinished sentence given in the original Latin; and, also from the fact, that the quotation, as now given correctly in the text above, is equally serviceable, as the inaccurate quotation in my former work, for establishing the conclusion, that Barlow was not considered Bishop of St. Asaph. In his translation, Mr. Evans has given the words omitted a meaning that is far from being warranted by the original; and this inaccuracy, as will presently appear, is more calculated to affect the sense of the passage, than the omission complained of. The passage referred to is thus rendered by him: "Yet with respect to the see of St. Asaph he could have been called nothing more *in law* than bishop elect." The words should be translated—"Yet with respect to the see of St. Asaph, he could have been *properly* (jure) called nothing more than bishop elect." Mr. Evans's rendering of the passage is calculated to leave on his reader's mind the impression, that, although consecrated, yet Barlow, in the law, could not have been regarded as Bishop of St. Asaph.

‡ Et factus est primum Menevensis, sub Hen. VIII., postea sub Edoardo VI., Anglorum regibus, Bathensis et Wellensis episcopus.

proves that it is very uncertain, that he was consecrated for St. Asaph's; and this is confirmed by the date *assigned* for his passing to the see of St. David's. Richard Rawlings, the former Bishop of St. David's, died on the 18th of February, 1535, and on the 10th of the following April,—just six weeks after the act of Barlow's *confirmation* to St. Asaph's, he is said to have been elected to the see of St. David's.

We have, moreover, a commission, which Mr. Evans admits to be authentic, dated 29th May, 1536—between five and six weeks *after* the date of the *significavit* produced by him, for the confirmation of Barlow's election to the see of St. David. In it the chapter of St. Asaph, is permitted to proceed to the election of a new bishop, to fill that see, vacant "by *the voluntary exchange*, (*libera transmutatio*) of William Barlow, the last BISHOP ELECT of that place." Not only do I infer from the use of the term *elect*,—and Mr. Evans cannot, in the present instance, object to the inference, as he attempts to prove Barlow's consecration by a strict construction of the documents he brings forward—that Barlow had never been more than bishop ELECT of St. Asaph's, but that before the 29th May, 1536, whatever be meant by *libera transmutatio*—he was not translated to St. David's at the time of the issuing of this writ. 1st. Because the word *translatio* is the proper phrase to express such a change; and of this Courayer was aware when he rendered the *libera transmutatio* by *translation*—a meaning it does not bear. 2d. Because, had Barlow been transferred to the see of St. David, six weeks before the issuing of this writ, this circumstance ought to have been mentioned; for such is the style of official documents on similar occasions.* 3d. A translation, however voluntary in the individual translated, is always supposed to be involuntary; inasmuch as it is a separation from the Church which the bishop is supposed to regard as his spouse. Hence *libera transmutatio*—or "voluntary translation," could never be used, in a public document, to express such a change. I infer that Barlow was not translated, but that he resigned his nomination to St. Asaph's. Be this as it may, so far from there being any evidence that he was consecrated for St. Asaph's, the docu-

* Per translationem ultimi episcopi ad archiepiscopatum Eborum. Rymer XV., 681.

Per translationem Revdi in Christo Patris—ad episcopum Londinensem.

ments and authorities adduced by me show, or at least render highly probable, that such was not the case.

From a comparison of what Buchanan and Lord Herbert narrate of this embassy, it appears likely that Barlow remained in Scotland several months, from November to the end of April or early part of May. During his absence, he was nominated to the see of St. Asaph's, as already mentioned,* and, on his resignation, perhaps, to that of St. David's. Before his nomination to either see, he was a notorious opposer of the old religion, and had distinguished himself as well by the violence of his language against its professors,† as by the open violation of his vows. On his return to England, it was easy for him to elude consecration, which he cannot be supposed to have received in Scotland; because, as an English prelate, he should be ordained by his own metropolitan, and because he was peculiarly obnoxious to the Catholic clergy of Scotland, who, justly, regarded him as an emissary of evil. His primate and himself regarded consecration as a useless ceremony; nor can Henry VIII. be supposed to have been more exact in requiring these worthless men, whom he found so useful in his schismatical projects, to observe the laws of the Church regarding consecration, than he was to apply to them the penalties they incurred by the notorious concubinage in which they lived. Hence, on Barlow's return to England, he may either have succeeded, by collusion with Cranmer, in being regarded as a bishop, especially as he passed from one see to another; or, what is more probable, have maintained himself in possession of the see, by the favour of the court, notwithstanding the equal notoriety of his heretical opinions, his immorality, and his want of consecration. That neither supposition is inadmissible will be manifest from the case of Latimer, who contrived to occupy the see of Worcester, from 1535 to 1539, without having been consecrated, and who might have occupied it until his death, had it not been for his opposition to the "Six Acts" of Henry VIII., which occasioned his resignation.

Second Proof. "In Cranmer's Register is found a certificate of that prelate, informing King Henry VIII., of the confirmation of the election, as Bishop of St. David's, of the Rev. Father Lord William Barlow, late Bishop of St. Asaph, and Commendator of

* Le Quien, t. 1, p. 474.

† See Barlow's letter in Strype, p. 106, 1535.

Bisham." Mr. Evans argues that although the *significavit* in reply to which this certificate was given, makes no mention of consecration, the words, "do what belong to the matter," necessarily imply it; that if Barlow were not consecrated, it was Cranmer's duty to supply the defect; and that, in case he did not do so, this certificate was a certificate that Cranmer had disobeyed the king's orders. "The *significavit*," says Mr. Evans, "is dated the 20th, the confirmation the 21st, the certificate the same day. This needless haste is inexplicable, if Barlow had not been previously consecrated."

This argument, however, has not prevented the recent editor of Dr. Bramhall's works, Mr. Haddan, from assigning the 11th of June as the period of Barlow's consecration. Cranmer's certificate then does not prove all that Mr. Evans supposes. He endeavours to strengthen his inference from the *significavit* of 20th April, by comparing its phraseology with that of a similar writ issued in the case of Bishop Bonner. But it might be easily shown, that, as there is a sufficient motive for giving a modified interpretation to the language of this last mentioned writ, there are also sufficient grounds for denying the inference which he has drawn from the *significavit* of 20th April. These grounds have been partly adduced in what I have already said on the subject, and will be more fully presented to the reader in the subsequent part of this chapter.

Third Proof. The writ of restitution of the temporalities of St. David's to Barlow, bears date on the 26th April, 1536.* On the 27th writs were issued for a Parliament, and the Bishop of St. David's, as one of the lords spiritual, was summoned. Mr. Evans brings an extract from a certified copy of the record of the return of this writ in Parliament, in the following words:

"Die veneris 30 Junii decimo tertio die Parliamenti. Hodie allatum est regium breve Reverendo in Christo Patri W. Menevensi Episcopo directum, quo idem Episcopus in præsenti Parlia-

* This writ has this clause, unusual at that time:—per nos *nominatum* episcopum in suum elegerunt episcopum et pastorem—a phrase not found in any similar act prior to Edward VI., who first made bishops by letters patent. Mr. Haddan supposes that Barlow was consecrated some time in June, 1536. Of course, he cannot maintain that the restitution of temporalities and the summons to Parliament, imply, as Courayer argues, previous consecration, which is the only point in dispute.

mento personaliter ad comparendum summonebatur, qui præsens admissus est ad suum eminentiæ locum salvo cuipiam jure."

("Friday, 30th June, the thirteenth day of the Parliament. This day the royal writ was brought in, directed to W. Bishop of St. David's, by which the said bishop was summoned personally to appear in the present Parliament, who being present, was admitted to his place of eminence, saving to every one his right.")

Although I am nowise concerned to deny what is here asserted, that Barlow sat in Parliament as Bishop of St. David's in 1536; because I shall establish, beyond the possibility of doubt, that his consecration cannot be inferred from this fact, I must apprise the reader that the above statement is, apparently, contradicted by two official documents, which would lead to the conclusion that neither in 1536, nor in 1541, was Barlow Bishop of St. David's. In the writs for the convocation of Parliament, in these years, the bishop of St. David's is indicated by the initial of his surname, "T.," which would show that Barlow, whose name was "William," was not then bishop of that see. In order to remove this difficulty, and, at the same time, to find a proof where he should have had to answer an objection, Courayer suppressed the "T." in both instances and actually cited these two writs to prove that Barlow was bishop of St. David's!!! When detected in this attempt to falsify a public document, he endeavoured to excuse himself by adducing a multiplicity of reasons to prove that the "T." of the two commissions had been erroneously put for W. What likelihood is there that the *same* mistake, if mistake it be, should occur in two official documents, written at an interval of five years?

Now, either the extract from the record is a fabrication,* to carry out the argument based on the *significavit*, certificate, and writ of restoration of temporalities, or it is a clerical error. If the discrepancy between the record and the writs be assigned to this latter cause, it is obvious that the same mistake, occurring in two writs, at an interval of five years, is much more improbable

* The following extract from Waterworth's Lectures on the Reformation, appears to contradict the fact on which Mr. Evans relies: "Unfortunately, how the business went through the two houses (of Parliament,) we cannot know from the journals, *for they are lost*."—Waterworth, p. 105; Act of 27 Henry VIII., A. D. 1536. Hardouin was not very unreasonable when he wrote: "Je voudrais qu'on me certifiat de quél age est ce journal, et à quelle année il commence, et à quelle année il finit.—Tom. 1, p. 458.

than a mistake in the single instance of the record. The proof derived from the record is then of no weight; that from the writ of temporalities is equally defective. But, as I have already intimated, I waive all advantage which might be derived from these two documents, and admit all that the extract adduced by Mr. Evans asserts,—that Barlow sat as bishop of St. David's in Parliament.

Fourth Proof. Barlow sat in convocation in 1536, and I am charged with great inconsistency, and a still heavier charge is insinuated against me, because, in one part of my former work, I spoke of Barlow, as bishop of St. David's, and in another sought to call this fact in question. Without incurring the censure of inconsistency, or meriting the application of Mr. Evans' unjustifiable insinuations, I could speak of Barlow, as bishop of St. David's, a thing which I asserted was the general belief, but respecting which, I observed, there were some very serious difficulties. Neither do I now deny that Barlow was bishop of St. David's; but I deny that the proofs adduced to establish that fact, justify the conclusion, which Mr. Evans wishes to infer from them, and the only thing which is material, namely, Barlow's consecration.

In the Convocation of 1536, Barlow subscribed as bishop of St. David's. This is not precisely the fact. William, Bishop of St. David signed, but the name 'Barlow' does not occur in the whole proceeding. In my former work, I stated, on the authority of Hardouin, that the preface to the articles sanctioned by that convocation, as well as the subscriptions thereto, were of later date than the articles themselves. His reasons are: "The annalist Stow, states that the clergy published these articles on the 8th of June, 1536, without making any mention of Henry VIII. The Latin writers of the annals of England, under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Mary, also state that these articles were published by the ecclesiastical authority. Now the preface, in the name of Henry VIII., would show, contrary to the above authorities, that it was not the ecclesiastical but the royal authority that published these articles. Besides, the doctrine of this preface was not that of Henry VIII., or of the convocation, there being but three sacraments recognized in it, baptism, eucharist, penance. Burnet, who produced this preface on the authority of a manuscript in the Cotton Library, Oxford, puts Barlow, or the bishop

of St. David's, the last but one,* whereas one of Courayer's Latin correspondents at first said, that he subscribed the last of all, a mistake which Courayer says, he subsequently corrected.

Whatever may be thought of the subscriptions to the acts of the Convocation at which Barlow is said to have assisted, no very satisfactory proof can be derived from them. These subscriptions are known to us only through writers who are deeply interested in the decision of this matter; and even they do not always agree with each other,† nor, as in the following instance, with themselves.

On the authority of his English correspondent, Courayer asserted "that Barlow subscribed the acts of the convocations held in 1536, 1537, 1540, and 1552, and that in all of these he acted as a bishop with other bishops; and that he is *never* designated by any other title than that of Bishop of St. David's." Hardouin very justly remarked, that this proved that Barlow was bishop of St. David's in 1552, whereas his translation to the see of Bath and Wells, is placed in the year 1548. Courayer endeavoured to remove the difficulty, on the authority of *another* letter from his English correspondent, who had, most unaccountably, fallen into a mistake by inserting the word "St. David's,"—Menevensis—where no such word was found in the subscriptions. What, then, was found, may it be asked? Simply, the word "Episcopus" (bishop). The removal of the word "Menevensis," from the extract given in the note at the bottom of the page, will give the passage such as it ought to have originally stood.‡ But, in this case, these subscriptions do not prove that Barlow had any more than the title of bishop, and this is all that is given him in the commission of 9th September, 1559.

* Thus, also, it is found in the *fac simile* of the subscriptions to that Convocation, given in Tierney's Dodd, Vol. I.

† "In the subscriptions to the Acts of Convocation, of 1536, as found in Burnet, there is simply *Menevensis*, not *Wilhelmus Menevensis*, as we now find; hence, the name of the Bishop of St. David's is not given by him."—Hardouin.

‡ C'est donc ainsi, qu'il faut lire cet endroit: In his *omnibus* cum reliquis episcopis tanquam episcopus egit; neque alio quam episcopi nomine perpetuo indigitatur. Courayer's translator thus gives the passage: "Moreover, he was present at the several Synods of 1537, 1540, and 1552, and subscribed in each in quality of Bishop of St. David's and *Bath*."—Courayer, Williams' translation, p. 57, London, 1725. Compare this with the above extract, found in the *Appendix* to that translation, p. 386. Either this assertion of Courayer's correspondent is inexact, or the subscription *Wilhelmus Meneven*, to the Acts of Convocation, in 1536, is a partial or total interpolation, for the word Meneven is found there. See *fac simile* referred to in a preceding note.

Mr. Haddan adduces the following extract as proof of Barlow having been Bishop of St. David's, at the time referred to.

"*An inquest*, made April 17, 4 Edward VI., (1550,) certifying the Barons of the Exchequer upon oath of twenty-three men, how often and how long the Bishopric of St. David's had been void since March 2, anno Henr. VIti.—Abstract in Wharton's MSS. Lamb. Libr., num. 585, p. 239, wherein it is declared, that 'R. Rawlins, D. D., succeeded Edw. Vochan, and died about the feast of the Purification of the B. V., about the twenty-seventh year of Henry VIII.,' i. e. Feb. 2, 1535–6; (it should be Feb. 18,) and that the Bishopric was vacant from Candlemas, (Feb 2,) until the feast of the App. Phil. and James, next,' (May 1, 1536); and further, 'that William Barlow, M. A., succeeded R. Rawlins, and was translated to the Bishopric of Bath and Wells about the 1st day of March, anno secundo, Edw. VI.,' (1547–8: the exact date is Feb. 3, in that year.)—Bramhall's works, N. edit. vol. iii. p. 228, col. 1."* Mr. Evans thinks, that this will remove all my doubts as to Barlow being the William translated from St. David's to Bath and Wells.

As it is not necessary for me to deny what he wishes to establish, but only the inference of Barlow's consecration, which he derives from his having been Bishop of St. David's, I shall merely observe on the extraordinary fact, that twenty-three men, on their oaths, should make such mistakes as to the dates, as is seen from the above extract; and this, although living so near the time assigned for their inquest! Again, William Barlow, M. A., is the title given to the Bishop of St. Asaph, transferred to St. David's. Did these twenty-three men examine documents, or did they not? Mr. Evans thinks that this extract suggests a different date for Barlow's consecration from that suggested by Mr. Haddan or himself. Whatever conjectures on the subject it may give rise to, it does not furnish the shadow of a proof that Barlow was consecrated at all.

Admitting, however, that Barlow was in possession of the Bishopric of St. David's, and subsequently of Bath and Wells, does it therefore follow that he was consecrated? Certainly not. He himself is said to have preached, that the king's nomination was sufficient to make a bishop, without any consecration,—a doctrine, says Dr. Milner, that seems to have been intended to meet the objection

* Apud Evans.

that he himself had never been consecrated.* Courayer acknowledges that "Barlow was accused of heresy for denying the necessity of consecration." With such sentiments, it was by no means difficult for him to elude the law requiring his consecration, especially when he had *exchanged* his first bishopric without having been consecrated, as I have already established. At a time when the ordinary course of things had been interrupted by the national apostacy, and when the chapters of the different cathedrals were merely the registers of the tyrant's will; when the Primate of England could publicly profess the doctrine, that it was of *necessity* that the apostles made bishops, as they lacked the ordinary power so to do, *not having a Christian king* among them!—to suppose that Barlow could have had any serious difficulty in passing for bishop, although not really such, is to manifest a want of acquaintance with the character of the man and of the times in which he lived.

The argument in favour of Barlow's consecration, drawn from the fact that he sat in parliament, is, according to Courayer himself, "not absolutely demonstrative;" neither is the suing out of the temporalities for the see of St. David's proof that he was consecrated; since Courayer confesses, that "the kings of England often dispensed with this usage,"—namely, that which required that consecration should precede such an act. We have a striking illustration of the fallacy of all the arguments by which the consecration of Barlow is inferred from the circumstances just referred to, in the case of Latimer and Ridley; especially of the former, who was promoted to Worcester in 1535, and remained in possession of that see until 1539. During this time he did many episcopal acts; was present, both in convocation and in parliament; if we can credit Cranmer's Register, officiated as assistant bishop at consecrations, and appears to have been regarded by his con-

* The words ascribed to Barlow are: "That if the King's Grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman (being learned) to be a bishop; that he so chosen (without mention made of any orders,) should be as good a bishop, *as he is*, or the best in England" He is said to have given utterance to this sentiment in his Cathedral Church of St. David's, shortly after the date assigned for his promotion to that see; since he was accused of it, says Courayer, in 1536. Mr. Evans urges it as a convincing proof of his having received consecration, otherwise, it would amount to nothing. If it be true that he thus spoke, I can only say that the man who could so express himself, in such circumstances, must be deemed capable of any duplicity, and that the rules which would guide us in our inferences from the words and acts of ordinary persons do not apply to such a one.

temporaries as a bishop. Besides, in the writ for suing out his temporalities, which on all hands is admitted to be authentic, his consecration is recited to have taken place; although no record of it is found in the archiepiscopal register of Cranmer, no more than of Barlow's.* And yet, it must be said, that he was never consecrated; since, in the reign of Queen Mary, he was degraded only from priests' orders. Ridley is another instance in point. If consecrated at all, he must have been consecrated by Cranmer, and according to the Roman Pontifical,† as Cranmer's Register testifies. The authority of that register, however, cannot be admitted, since it is contradictory of the decision of a public tribunal. The description Mr. Haddan gives of this register, shows that it is nothing more than a collection of loose leaves, which were not bound into a volume until, perhaps, the accession of Elizabeth.‡ The words of Dr. Brooke, Bishop of Gloucester, when he was about to degrade Ridley, previously to his being delivered over to the hands of the secular power, show that he

* The following is Mr. Haddan's argument in support of Latimer's consecration "Latimer is said by Le Neve, from Fuller, (Worthies' county, Leicestershire,) to have been consecrated in Sept. 1535; but his installation, according to Wharton, (*Anglia Sacra*, 1, 539. from the Dioc. Reg,) took place Aug. 20, 1535. Probably, then, he was consecrated in the latter month. Now, in the month of September, 1535, there were two other consecrations in the province of Canterbury, and only two. Fox, to the see of Hereford, and Hilsey, to that of Rochester, both occurring at Winchester, both omitted in Cranmer's Register, and both recorded in the respective diocesan registers; and these two bishops, together with Latimer, were restored to their temporalities by writs dated the same day, Oct. 4, 1535, (Rymer, XIV., pp. 552–524,) wherein, according to the (then) customary form, consecration is in each case recited as already performed. There had been no previous consecration in 1535, (Latimer's excepted,) later than Shaxton's, on April 11. The *presumption* then is, that Latimer was also consecrated at Winchester, and the omission in the Archiepiscopal Register, being at once accounted for and supplied in the two cases, can be of no force in the third."—Haddan; apud Evans, pp. 159, 160. The force of this *presumption* is much weakened, or rather entirely destroyed, by the fact referred to in the text. Why degrade Cranmer from the episcopal order, and Latimer from priest's orders only, if this latter had been consecrated?

† Heylin says, that Ridley was consecrated on 5th Sept., 1547; more than two years before the introduction of the ordinal of Edward VI.

‡ "It appears that the most shameful negligence on the subject of the Registers, existed during the primacies of Warham and Cranmer. The Register of the latter, according to Mr. Haddan, who appears to have seen it, or at least received a trustworthy account of it, consists of 'collections of loose leaves bound together at the death of the archbishop.'—Bramhall's works, N. E., vol. iii., p. 173, note *a*. Now if they were really bound immediately upon the death of the archbishop, there might be some room for suspicion of foul play,—if, as is more probable, they were not bound until the accession of Elizabeth, they were exposed for several years in a very perilous condition, in addition to the careless manner in which they were kept."—Evans, p. 156.

was a mere priest:—"We must against our willes proceed, according to our commission, to degrading, taking from you the dignitie of priesthood; for we take you for no bishop." Had Ridley been actually consecrated, according to the Roman Pontifical, this could not have been said; nor would the degradation from the priesthood have authorized the civil power to proceed to his execution. It is, therefore, a very insufficient answer, as well as a very unwarrantable assertion, to say, as Mr. Evans does, that the denial of Latimer and Ridley's episcopal character "was only a paltry insult contrived by the low-minded men to whom the dirty work of the persecution was intrusted;"* since, whatever may have been their hostility to the "pretended bishops" on whom they had to pronounce sentence, they could not, without incurring ecclesiastical censures, overlook the privileges of the order to which the condemned are supposed to have belonged.

Collier endeavours to account for this circumstance, by saying that Latimer had resigned his see in the reign of Henry VIII., thrown off his episcopal habit, and pretended no further to the title.† The cause of the non-allowance of Ridley's episcopal character, was, he thinks, because his consecration had taken place after the separation of England from the see of Rome; and that, therefore, all such consecrations were regarded as invalid by the Catholic clergy. Neither of these explanations can be admitted. Once a priest or bishop, for ever one: and, therefore, the voluntary renunciation of the episcopal habit, and, as far as it was possible for him, of the episcopal character, could not have caused Latimer, had he been actually consecrated, to have been regarded as a simple priest, and, as such, only degraded from that rank. With regard to the case of Ridley it is sufficient to say, that the opinion Collier attributes to the Catholic clergy then in England, among whom were many of the first names in theology, namely, that heresy or schism invalidate the orders conferred in such circumstances, had been, for many ages before, exploded as erroneous. But we are not left to our own assertion on this subject. We have the express declaration of Cardinal Pole, in the directions given by him

* That such was not the character of these prelates is very certain. Speaking of the bishops of Queen Mary's reign, during the time referred to, Soames says: "The bishops eagerly availed themselves of any subterfuge by which they could escape pronouncing the revolting sentences."—IV., p. 412; apud Waterworth.

† Collier, Pt. II., vol. 6, London, 1840.

to the Chapter of Canterbury, on the 8th Jan. 1555, whereby he empowered that body to reconcile to the church, those who had fallen away in the two preceding reigns, without requiring ordination, except where the ecclesiastical form had been neglected, as will be shewn in the succeeding chapter. The cause assigned by Collier is, then, untenable. A much more likely cause of Dr. Brooke's conduct was probably the fact, that they had neglected to receive episcopal consecration. This they could only have done by collusion with Cranmer; and hence the presumption is that Barlow, who was of the same party, neglected to receive episcopal consecration, a presumption which the inferential evidence arising from the testimonies and facts to be adduced by me, renders morally certain.

Having shewn the inconclusiveness of the argument by which it is sought to infer Barlow's consecration from the facts generally admitted as connected with his history, I have now to state the reasons which justify us in calling it in question.

There is no record of Barlow's consecration. This is admitted. The importance of this event to the Anglican hierarchy must render it a matter of astonishment, that the document has not been preserved. But it is said, that the consecration of other bishops of those times is admitted as certain, although no record of such is found in the archiepiscopical register of Canterbury; and that, therefore, it is unfair to urge the importance of Barlow's consecration as a motive to strengthen the inference drawn from the non-existence of the record. This importance could not indeed have been foreseen, when the consecration took place; but it must have been felt at least from the time of Parker's consecration, when all vestige of it could scarcely have disappeared; or if such were the case, when an authentic record might have been made from the testimonies of those who had been witnesses of it, or could otherwise establish it.

The fact, however, is not as the objection supposes. "Of the twelve bishops," says Dr. Milner, "whom he (Elrington) sets down as unregistered, two of them never existed in the sees for which he names them; and, with respect to the remaining ten, I produce the consecration registers of them all except one, who, as I give reason to believe, was consecrated at Rome." Mr. Haddan establishes the same fact, although he does not always ground

his conclusions on the registers.* The defect of the archiepiscopal records is thus supplied by the diocesan registers; but of Barlow's consecration no record whatever exists.

I do not, however, maintain that the absence of all record of Barlow's consecration is a proof that he was not consecrated: but as the present controversy is coëval with the existence of the Anglican hierarchy, its absence suggests a violent suspicion that such is the fact. We have, besides, public undeniable facts, and most important admissions on the part of Anglican divines, which warrant us in denying that he was consecrated in the time of Henry VIII.

Mr. Haddan insists that the imperfect character of Cranmer's register is a sufficient motive for diregarding its omission of Barlow's consecration. "The omission," he says, "would be a conclusive objection during Parker's primacy, when the Register was kept with peculiar care; it is absolutely none at all during Cranmer's, when it was kept with equal carelessness. For how stand the facts? There are recorded in Cranmer's Register, during his primacy of twenty years or thereabouts, (1533—1553,) the confirmations and consecrations of thirty-six, (including those of Reppis,) and the confirmations upon translation (leaving Barlow out of the question) of eight bishops, and the mandate of [sic] the Archdeacon of Canterbury, to enthrone, in the case of two other translations in 1550, (subsequently to Edward the Sixth's act abolishing election and confirmation;) and there are omitted in the same Register and period, the confirmations prior to the statute (just referred to) in 1547, of two, and the mandates subsequently to that date, for three, and the consecrations of no less than eight, bishops, (exclusive of Barlow,) being something more than a fourth of the whole number of actual entries; and in the cases of four of the last named eight, the confirmations are recorded, but nothing more, and of a fifth, one page and a half at the commencement of the record of confirmation, breaking off in the middle of a page and of a sentence, and of three more no documents whatever," [Latimer, Hilsey, and King,] "while the consecrations of three of the eight—two, whose confirmations are recorded, and one who is not mentioned at all—are known to be

* Apud Evans, p. 159.

recorded in the diocesan Registers" [Fox, Skyp, and Hilsey,] "which last, in Barlow's case, do not exist; and of those of the other five, (of which four, for aught that has yet appeared, may be recorded also in the respective diocesan Registers,—the fifth was to a suffragan see) there can be, as will be seen below, no reasonable doubt. Further, at the very time when I have supposed Barlow to have been consecrated, the consecrations of three bishops ought to have been recorded, (according to what has been said above,) viz. Sampson, Reppis, and Barlow,—of these, the confirmation only of the first is entered (f. 189 a—192 b,) and the record of consecration, which, in his case, took place (almost certainly) the very next day after his consecration, is omitted; the entry relating to the second is neither regular nor in its place, being postponed (as is also the record of Barlow's confirmation to St. David's, which it immediately follows) until after the consecrations of 1537,—viz. to fol. 208, a—212, b, while the regular entry of consecration is entirely omitted, and the record closes with the archbishop's certificates of both confirmation and consecration in which (unusually) the particulars of the consecration are given at length. What argument can possibly be founded, under these circumstances, on the omission to register the consecration of the third? An omission, it is to be remembered, not of a second part of a document of which the first part stands correctly in the Register, (which would be the case had he been consecrated and confirmed at the same time, and which is the case with others undoubtedly consecrated,) but of a short and distinct entry, relating to an act certainly differing in date from both his confirmations, and probably above seven weeks subsequent to the latter of them. It is plain, that from an omission of this kind, in a book kept so carelessly and so irregularly, and known to omit consecrations which are proved to have taken place, no negative conclusion whatever can be drawn. Such a register is good evidence of what it contains; it is no evidence at all against what it simply omits. Upon the whole, then, as the case stands, the Register, by recording Barlow's confirmations, affords an undeniable presumption (not against, but) for his consecration also: and the supposition that he really was consecrated on June 11, in itself (date apart) a fact to be taken for granted unless disproved, appears to be not only perfectly consistent with every existing document connected with the subject; so that no difficulty lies in the way of admitting its

truth; but on the contrary, to be required to explain the existing evidence, so that insuperable difficulties arise, should we suppose the case to have been otherwise."*

The foregoing observations certainly shew that nothing can be inferred from the mere omission of Barlow's consecration in Cranmer's register, where there is positive proof to supply the defect. Our argument is not, however, grounded on the mere omission in that register, but on the omission of the fact in any register, diocesan or archiepiscopal, and on the denials before referred to. Latimer's consecration is omitted in Cranmer's register; neither is it found in the diocesan register of Worcester; and we know that he was never consecrated from the fact of his degradation, in Mary's reign, from priest's orders only. Barlow's consecration is nowhere mentioned, and we have indirect testimony either that he was not consecrated in Henry's reign, or did not consecrate Parker, as will be shewn in a succeeding part of this chapter, as well as in a variety of facts to which I shall presently refer. We have, then, something more than the omission, which, it cannot be denied, in itself and in the circumstances of the case, is calculated rather to awaken doubt than to determine any thing in the matter. The fallacy of the reasoning of Mr. Haddan must be obvious. He *supposes* that Barlow ought to have been consecrated on a certain day, on which two other bishops were consecrated, whose consecration is not, indeed, recorded in Cranmer's register, but in the registers of their respective dioceses: and hence he infers that the omission of the case of Barlow cannot be urged against him, especially as the diocesan register of St. David's has been lost. He gravely tells us that this fact, (date apart,) "is to be taken for granted unless disproved," i. e. we are to take Mr. Haddan's *supposition* for a proof.

The *significavit* of 22d February, 1535-6, before referred to, enables Mr. Evans thus to prove that Barlow must have been consecrated. By the 25th Henry VIII., the archbishop, on receiving the *significavit* was bound to confirm the election, and consecrate the elect within twenty days. In reference to the case before us, Mr. Evans asks: "Why would he (the archbishop) not do it?" And yet Mr. Evans himself tells us that he did *not* do it;

* Preface to Vindication, etc., Bramhall's Works, N. E., vol. iii., 7th & 8th leaves of Preface, which are not paged; apud Evans, pp. 157, 158.

since he assigns Barlow's consecration to some time in the month of April—nearly six weeks after the date of the *significavit*. The positive reasons for doubting that he ever was consecrated are neither few nor insignificant.

1. He was not consecrated for St. Asaph's. (See pa. 151, etc.)

2. The collection of Rymer contains no acts of his election or nomination to any bishopric—no *Regius assensus* or *significavit*, after his resignation of the see of St. Asaph's.* The acts produced to establish his occupancy of the two sees of St. David's, and Bath, and Wells—although admitted by me, for the sake of argument—are open to the charge of fabrication, and are inconsistent with the act of 29th May, 1536.

3. The variety of opinions regarding the date of his supposed consecration, shews that the event itself is very uncertain. Godwin places his consecration on the 22d of February, 1535–6. Wharton, and the author of the *Fasti Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, refer his *confirmation* to the 23d of February. Strype assigns the 15th of September, 1535: Mr. Evans some day in April, 1536: Mr. Haddan the 11th of June following; and the extract from an inquest referred to by Mr. Haddan, (p. 172, Evans,) 'suggests' a date different from any other.

4. In the account of the service for the French king, performed on the 9th of September, in St. Paul's, at London, Parker is mentioned as the officiating prelate, although all acknowledge that he was then only *elect*. Barlow and Scory assisted him. Is there any likelihood that they would have assisted a bishop *elect*, had they themselves been consecrated? The only exception to the general custom of making those in inferior orders assist those in higher orders, is in the case of the Cardinal priests, who, on account of their dignity as Cardinals, are occasionally assisted by bishops. But we are not left to mere inference on this occasion. Stow expressly states, that "Doctor Parker, archbishoppe of Cantorburie elect, Doctor Barlow, Bishoppe of Chicester elect, Doctor Scorey, Bishoppe of Hereford elect," performed the ceremony. Were Barlow and Scory *elect* in any other sense than Parker?

5. The commission of the 9th of September, is directed to Barlow and Scory along with four Catholic bishops. Barlow and

* Il n'y a dans Rymer aucun acte ni de son election, ou nomination, ni de *Regius assensus*, ni de consecration, pour aucun evêché depuis la demission volontaire qu il fit de S. Asaph.—Hard., tom. i, p. 466.

Scory are merely styled "bishops;" whereas, the Catholic prelates have the titles of their respective sees attached to their names. In the supposed commission of 6th of Dec. 1559, Barlow is not merely styled bishop, but "formerly bishop of Bath, now elect of Chichester,"—and Scory, "formerly bishop of Chester, now elect of Hereford." This is the style that we should find in the commission of the 9th of September. If both commissions be authentic, as the defenders of Anglican Ordinations contend, how are we to account for this remarkable difference of style?

6. If Barlow had been consecrated in the reign of Henry VIII. it seems probable that Queen Elizabeth would have been crowned by him, instead of subjecting herself to the mortification of the refusal she received from the Catholic bishops, and obliging herself to swear, as she did at her coronation, to maintain the Catholic Religion, which she had already determined to extirpate from the kingdom. Indeed, we are not left to our mere inferences on this subject. Dr. Heylin in endeavouring to solve this difficulty, mentions only "three bishops, *of King Edward's making*,"* as then alive, who were friendly to the reformation. Had Barlow been one of the bishops consecrated in Henry's reign, would not he also have been mentioned in addition to these three? Either then he was one of the three, or had as yet received no form of consecration.

7. If Barlow were really a bishop, especially as he is supposed to have been consecrated according to the Roman pontifical, it is not likely that Elizabeth would have applied to the Catholic bishops, in the case of Parker, and thus exposed herself, on a most important occasion, to the mortification of a refusal. Were he a

* "It cannot," says Heylin, "be denied that there were three bishops living of king Edward's making, all of them zealously affected to the reformation. And possibly it may seem strange that the Queen received not the crown rather from one of their hands, than to put herself unto the hazard of so many denials as had been given her by the others."—Heylin's Hist. of Eliz., p. 106. He then assigns some possible reasons for the Queen's preference, but brings nothing to prove that these motives influenced her choice. That Barlow was one of the three may be inferred from the fact, that a bill was introduced into the Parliament of 1559, to restore Barlow, Story, and Coverdale to their former sees, and it was lost. "Barlow, having wasted the revenue of the church of Wells, would not, with any comfort, behold a place which he had so spoiled; and Scory, having been deprived of the see of Chichester under pretence of wanting a just title to it, desired not to be put upon the hazard of a second ejection."—Heylin, p. 123.

bishop, Landaff, whose unwillingness must have been known, would not have been named in the supposed commission of the 6th of December. Indeed, the delay in the consecration of Parker cannot be explained, if we suppose that Barlow, not to say any thing of Scory and others, whose names are mentioned, was really a bishop. The only reason assigned by Courayer for this extraordinary delay, is, that perhaps it was difficult to find bishops willing to perform the ceremony.

8. In the conference held between the Catholic and Protestant theologians, in the commencement of Elizabeth's reign, Scory is the only bishop on the Protestant side, although there were several bishops on the part of the Catholics.* Were Barlow a bishop, or did he even pass for one, should we not expect to find him present on this occasion?

9. It is said that Barlow was regarded as a bishop by his contemporaries, who were the best judges of the matter, and who, unquestionably, would not have recognized him as such, had he not been consecrated. To this it may be replied, 1st, that the fact of his having been so regarded depends on the value of the proofs above adduced, which are not conclusive;† and 2dly, If he were looked on as a bishop, who had been consecrated by Cranmer in the time of Henry VIII., and if he consecrated Parker at Lambeth, as is pretended, the fact of Parker's consecration would never have been called in question by these Catholic theologians, who publicly asserted that this latter had been made bishop *without any ceremony*, and who urged the nullity of any consecration, in which a bishop did not officiate,—an objection that never could have been proposed, had Barlow, who is supposed to have consecrated Parker, taken part in that ceremony, and been himself a consecrated bishop. Would not the inference then, either that Barlow was never consecrated, or that he never consecrated

* Heylin; Elizabeth, 112.

† It is a curious fact, that a respectable protestant historian, who records Parker's consecration by Barlow, Scory and Coverdale, makes Parker consecrate both Barlow and Scory, and this *all* in the same paragraph: "And being consecrated himself, he (Parker,) afterwards consecrated William Barlow, Bishop of Chichester,—and John Scory, Bishop of Hereford."—Baker's Chronicle, p. 329. Sir Richard Baker was High Sheriff of Oxfordshire in 1621. He published his *Chronicle* in 1641. In the significavit for Barlow to Chichester, as originally published in Rymer, Parker was directed to consecrate Barlow, but a reference to the original document in the Rolls' office is said to have shown that the word *consecrare* is not found in it.

Parker at Lambeth, be much more fairly deduced from these facts?

10. It appears by the language of Fulke, in his reply to Stapleton, that, with the exception of Kitchin of Landaff, all the Protestant bishops, at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, had been consecrated in the reign of King Edward. This is mentioned in a passage, cited by Mr. Evans, on the authority of Dr. Elrington, and is stated to be taken from the London edition of 1584. "It is a lie of this author's (Stapleton) to say that they do not use the laying on of hands, and that, at the beginning, there was no bishop to lay them on. For there was one popish bishop in place, and many consecrated in the time of King Edward." The one popish bishop in place is Kitchin of Landaff. Had Barlow been consecrated in Henry's reign, and had he consecrated Parker at Lambeth, can we believe that Fulke would not have mentioned the fact? Either Barlow had nothing to do with the alleged consecration, or he is included among the "many consecrated in the time of King Edward." The same fact is affirmed by Fitzsimmons, a Catholic writer, quoted by Courayer. "But there were not in all England, three, or two, or one bishop who could, and would consecrate the others."

I shall conclude this long and intricate examination in the words of one who could have had no motive but love of truth, to make him draw from the facts stated or referred to in this chapter, the same conclusion which Catholic writers have generally arrived at. Mr. Stevens, a Protestant minister, in his *Great Question*, thus expresses himself on the present subject. "It is a wonderful thing by what chance or providence it happened, that Barlow's consecration, who was the principal actor in this, should no where appear, nor any positive proof of it be found, in more than fourscore years since it was first questioned, by all the search that could be made by so many learned and industrious and curious persons; as Mr. Mason, employed by the archbishop, and all the assistants (assistance) he had in his time, whose book was printed in 1613, and again with additions in 1625 and 1638; Bishop Bramhall and all the assistance he could procure in his time, about the year 1657; Dr. Burnet encouraged by the Parliament 1679, and all the helps and many assistance he had; and the indefatigable Mr. Wharton, who had corrected and discovered so many faults, oversights, and mistakes in others before him,

besides many others, that he was ever consecrated at all. It is true, Bishop Godwin, Bishop of Hereford, says, that he was consecrated February 22, 1535, but says neither where, nor by whom, nor produceth, or so much as refers to, any evidence or proof of what he says. And both Mr. Mason and Mr. Wharton agree and prove that what he says cannot be true. Mason and Bramhall take much pains to prove it (Barlow's consecration) by circumstances and probabilities, for that all things were done for him, and to him and by him, that belong to a true and complete bishop, except only that of consecration; especially from the restitution of his temporalities, which they would have us believe is always after consecration; but whatever it ought to be either by law or custom, it was not then always so observed, as before in the case of Stokesley, bishop of London, who had his temporalities July 14th, 1530, and was not consecrated till November 27th after. (Wharton de episcop. Lond. p. 189.) And since twice in the case of Bonner, who, elected Bishop of Hereford, had restitution of his temporalities to his proctor, while he himself was yet beyond sea; and afterwards elected bishop of London, had his temporalities November 18, 1539, and yet was not consecrated till April 4th, 1540.* Nor is it more strange that of

* This assertion of Mr. Stevens, in which he follows Courayer, who follows Godwin, is denied by Hardouin, on what appears to be very sufficient grounds. Bonner was nominated to the see of Hereford in 1538; and on the 27th of November of that year, the king's commission issued to Cranmer for his consecration. Rymer, T. xiv., p. 599. According to the statute of Henry VIII., before referred to, the consecration should take place within twenty days. Why then delay the consecration for eighteen months? In the act restoring the temporalities of the see of London to him, after his translation to that see, Cranmer is only said to have *confirmed* him: there is no mention made of his supposed consecration on this occasion.—Rymer, xiv., p. 650. And although in the commission for his installation into the see of London, his Metropolitan is commanded to do all that was on his part necessary—in consecratione, confirmatione, et installatione prædicti electi,—these words are evidently the usual phraseology of such documents, and by no means can be taken as proof that Bonner was not yet consecrated. In fact, Godwin contradicts his own assertion with regard to Bonner's consecration; for he says:—'In Londinensi Ecclesia per *installationem* collocatur, Aprilis 3, 1540,'—and does not make any mention of his consecration. Indeed, his consecration could not have taken place on that day, it being the Saturday before Low Sunday. This oversight of Godwin, however, has been corrected by the industry of Courayer, who takes the *installation* for the *consecration* of Barlow, and as the latter ceremony should have occurred on a Sunday, changes the 3d into the 4th of April! There is, indeed, another commission for the installation of Bonner into the see of London, in which Cranmer is ordered—consecrare, ipsumqtie, prout moris est episcopalibus insigniis investire—(to consecrate, and, as is the custom, invest him with the episcopal insignia,) but this commission is not conclusive proof. Besides, the fact that Bonner was consecrated before his translation to London, is estab-

all the acts necessary for that purpose the consecration should be omitted, especially at that time when it was set so light by, than that of all the records and entries of those acts, that only of the consecration, if there had been any, should be wanting, when all the other acts appear in their proper courts, as Bramhall tells us, p. 482. He was elected January 16, 1535-6, bishop of Asaph, and confirmed the 23d, and about the same time was in the king's service in Scotland. Legationem apud Scotiæ regem ab Henrico Angliæ rege missus, obiit, says Wharton; and April 20th following, was elected bishop of St. David's, the translation confirmed by the archbishop, the 21st, and the temporalities restored the 26th of the same month; but the record mentions nothing of any consecration preceding, but his election and confirmation by the archbishop only. Ipsumq. sic electum episcopum prædictæ ecclesiæ Menevensi præfecit. The short time between his election to St. Asaph's and the translation to St. David's, and his absence in Scotland, might well prevent his consecration for that time; and the translation, especially if he continued any considerable time in Scotland, make his consecration, when he came home, never questioned or thought of; especially having his spiritualities by the archbishop's confirmation, and his temporalities restored by the king; and it is like enough he might concur with the archbishop in slight thoughts of such a formality. For whatever was his learning, it seems his virtue was so little, and the offence that he and Scory had given by their behaviour so great, that they were never so much as restored by Queen Elizabeth to their former sees, but put into meaner ones, as the historian informs us in his abridgment, p. 250. Nor would she be crowned by either of them, though she could hardly get any others to do it."*

lished by public acts bearing his name as bishop of Hereford and of London, several months previous to his supposed consecration, in April, 1540. This part of Mr. Stevens's argument can, consequently, be only used by those who adopt this opinion, as an *argumentum ad hominem;* and thus applied, the consequence he deduces from it, cannot be rejected by those who believe Bonner's translation to have occurred before his consecration.

* Stevens, quoted by Dr. Challenor, "Grounds of the Old Religion," pp. 150–152. In this last named work I find the following sketch of Barlow's character: "Barlow, of Bath and Wells, was a canon regular, but broke through his religious vows by a sacrilegious marriage. He was a man of Cranmer's temper, who could shift about with the times, and was ever pliant to the inclinations of the court. He joined with Cranmer in his extravagant notions of the royal authority in spirituals. —Burnet; Record, 21. And as he professed King Henry's religion during that king's life, so was he so complaisant to King Edward, Queen Mary, and Queen Elizabeth, as to conform to their majesties also in their respective professions. For in Queen Mary's time he not only renounced his reformed divinity, but pretended

Mr. Haddan, the recent editor of Bramhall, thus endeavours to show that the validity of Parker's consecration does not depend, as far as the consecrating prelate is concerned, on the episcopal character of Barlow: "It appears by the register, that Barlow presided at Parker's consecration; i. e. Parker was presented to him by the other bishops, and the usual interrogations were addressed to Parker by him, while all the four bishops together, joined in the imposition of hands, in the use of the form of words, and in the delivery of the Bible, i. e. in the consecration itself,—the position occupied by Barlow, therefore, does not answer to that of the consecrating bishop, (as it is termed,) who was usually either the metropolitan himself, or one commissioned by him; for the latter (according to the canon of the fourth Council of Carthage, and according to our ordinal, both King Edward's and the present form,) pronounces the words of consecration alone, the 'assistant' bishops joining in the imposition of hands,—(in the words, however, also, according to the Roman ordinal, although in a lower tone,)—whereas here in consecrating the metropolitan himself, all joined throughout and equally. It follows, then, upon every theory, that the absence of Barlow's consecration, if it were so, would not invalidate that of Parker."*

On this I must remark that, if the ordinal of Edward was followed, the account of the record is to be disregarded as inaccurate. If the ordinal was not followed, what could have caused a departure from its directions, in the most important part of the whole service, unless the desire to make up for the quality of those who took part in this ceremony? I cannot imagine any other motive which could have caused the new prelates to disregard the rubrics of their own ordinal on this occasion. I shall add a few words on the prelates who are said to have assisted Barlow in Parker's consecration; premising, however, that I shall not allow, for the reasons already stated, the validity or invalidity of their orders to affect the question.

John Scory and Miles Coverdale† are said to have been conse-

to so much zeal in the cause of the Church, as to revise and publish a book which he had in King Henry's time written against Luther and the Reformation. Dr. Heylin, p. 54, adds, that 'being translated (in King Edward's days,) from the see of St. David to Bath and Wells, he gratified the Lord Protector with a present of eighteen or nineteen manors which anciently belonged to this see.'"—Pp. 188, 189.

* Bramhall's Works, new edition, vol. iii., p. 136, note 7.

† "Scory, usurper of the see of Chichester, was a religious man under monastic vows, but forfeited his first faith to God and the Church, for the sake of a female

crated on the 30th of August, 1551, by Cranmer assisted by Ridley and Hodgskins, under Edward VI., and according to his ordinal. Some Catholic writers have doubted of these consecrations, because the ordinal was not sanctioned by parliament, until the following year. This, however, is a mistake. The ordinal was not added to the Common Prayer Book until the 5 & 6 Edward VI., (1552,) but by the act of parliament, empowering the king to employ commissioners to compose it, 3 & 4 Edward, (1550,) it was declared to have force from the 1st of April, then next following, i. e. 1 April, 1550. Others call into question Scory's and Coverdale's consecration, because Holliwood who wrote in 1603, speaks of Scory as a priest, as does also Constable in the manuscript cited by Champney. (Chapt. vii.) There is, indeed, every reason to suppose that the rehabilitation of Scory by Bonner in 1554 is a fabrication, as it is incompatible with the principles Bonner is known to have followed, and contains other intrinsic evidences of forgery. It is not, however, difficult to reconcile the language of Holliwood and Constable with the fact of Scory's and Coverdale's consecration under Edward, such being regarded as invalid.

Still, when we remember that Ridley was not consecrated, although Cranmer's register attested that he was, we cannot safely place implicit reliance on the record, found in it,* of Scory's and

friend. In the beginning of Queen Mary's reign he recanted, renounced his wife, and did penance, but relapsed soon after. 'It seems,' says Burnet, Abridgment, l. 3, p. 250, 'that both Scory and Barlow gave great offence by their behaviour; for though they were the only surviving reformed bishops, when Queen Elizabeth succeeded, yet they were so far from being promoted that they were not so much as restored to their former sees, being put in meaner ones.' Coverdale, of Exeter, had been an Augustin friar, but broke through his solemn vows, like most of the rest of the reformers, for the sake of a woman. He was joined with Tindal in the translation of the Bible; a work performed with so little fidelity, that Bishop Tunstal, a prelate equally eminent for virtue and learning, discovered no less than 2,000 corruptions in the New Testament alone. He was so great a precisian, that when he was to assist at the consecration of Archbishop Parker, if any credit may be given to the Lambeth records, he could not be induced to use the episcopal habit, but only a plain black coat. He was not restored by Queen Elizabeth to his former see, nor advanced to any other. So that it is likely that the queen had no opinion of him."—Grounds of the Old Religion, p. 189. Coverdale was *nominated* to the see of Exeter, without election, and received the investiture of his temporalities on the 14th of Aug., 1551.—Rymer, XV., p. 283. The *significavit* for his consecration bears date on the following day. That neither he nor Scory were ever consecrated, may be inferred from the fact that Stow calls them bishops elect, in his description of the obsequies for Henry II., of France, in Sept., 1559, (p. 640.)

* The authenticity of Cranmer's register is denied by Hardouin, on the following grounds: 1st. The record of Ridley's consecration is dated the 5th of Septem-

Coverdale's consecration; especially as we know the puritanical spirit of this latter, and bring to mind how much more easy it was for him to give a signal proof of his reprobation of ceremonies under Edward than under Elizabeth. The Suffragan of Bedford was originally named Richard, both in the *significavit* for Parker's consecration, as well as in the record of that ceremony. He is also named Richard in the life of Parker referred to in the preceding chapter. John has since been substituted for Richard, but it must always be uncertain whether Richard or John officiated on that occasion. John Hodgeskin was consecrated according to Cranmer's register in 1537. He was one of the court sycophants of that reign; and Cranmer's register, after the instance of Ridley, is but poor authority for believing in the occurrence of any fact, not otherwise attested. It may be safely asserted that he was not consecrated under Henry VIII. 1st. Fulke, in 1580, knew only of *one* such bishop, the one in place, although "there were also others that were consecrated in King Edward's days." 2d. Either he was not consecrated under Henry, or did not consecrate Parker, as must be inferred from the repeated challenges made by the Catholic writers to the

ber—"Die Dominico, quinto die mensis Septembris"—and all the older historians assign the same date, apparently on the authority of the register. The *significavit* for his confirmation and consecration, is dated the 14th September! This act, which naturally should precede the former, is placed after it. The 5th of September, in that year, was on Friday, not Sunday. This blunder has been ascribed to the clerk who made the entry; and Sunday, the 25th of September, is assigned by Courayer, (*Defense*, p. 136,) as the date of his consecration. 2d. The register says that Ridley was consecrated, *more ecclesiæ Anglicanæ solito, per sacri chrismatis unctionem et manus impositionem.* This unusual reference to the rite renders it very probable that whoever wrote this record knew that Ridley's episcopal character was denied; that he was degraded from priests' orders only in the following reign; and the object of this unusual statement of the nature of the rite by which he was consecrated, was to hold up Ridley's judges as persons influenced by blind hatred. 3d. The record of Ferrar's consecration for the see of St. David's, is dated 9th Sept., 1548. Fox, whose acts and monuments were published in 1583, assigns it to 1547. The writ for the restitution of his temporalities, is dated 31st July—Rymer, XV., p. 173; where also is found the *significavit* for his consecration, dated the following day, 1st Aug. Of course, the latter is irreconcilable with the former, which, having the statement of Fox to sustain it—not to mention any other motive—must be preferred. Cade and Godwin assign the year 1549, as that of Ferrar's consecration. According to the Register, Ferrar was consecrated *per impositionem manuum episcoporum*—words which indicate the use of Edward's Ordinal on the occasion. The Roman Pontifical was not abolished before 1549; and the Ordinal of Edward VI., was required to be used from and after the 1st of April, 1550. It was not printed before March, 1550. This made Godwin disregard the date of the Register, and put down 1549 as that of Ferrar's consecration.

first bishops of Elizabeth, to say by whom they had been consecrated. "But seeing your bishops were neither consecrated by those who lineally succeeded the apostles, nor have, by your *confession*, more power by God's law than a priest, you both have false bishops without the true church, and a false church without true bishops."*

CHAPTER VI.

ORDINAL OF KING EDWARD VI.

Parker is said to have been consecrated according to the form or ordinal which derives its name from King Edward VI. Were this much disputed fact satisfactorily established, and the episcopal character of Barlow, Parker's supposed consecrator, as certain as it is doubtful, the question still remains, was the form of ordination valid,—that is, was such a ceremony made use of on the occasion as, according to the principles admitted equally by Catholics and Anglicans on this subject, and the example of Christian antiquity; may be considered suitable for the occasion? Whatever difference of opinion exists among Catholic writers concerning the facts connected with this controversy, there is none as to the question before us.† Courayer cannot be cited as an example to the contrary; because it is evident from his work that he was the advocate of the Anglican clergy, and his subsequent history shews that he cannot be regarded as having been sincerely attached to the Church whose practice he so pertinaciously opposed. I shall restrict myself on this subject to such proofs of the invalidity of Edward's ordinal as history supplies, not, however, neglecting to

* Harding's "*Detection*," apud Le Quien.

† "Let it not for a moment be imagined, that in thus waiving the inquiry into the value of English ordinations, I am prepared to admit their validity. On the contrary, my sincere and earnest conviction is, that, independent of all historical questions, they are decidedly invalid and nothing worth."—High Church Claims, etc., by Nicholas Wiseman, D.D.

refute the principles by which Anglican writers endeavour to maintain its validity.

During the time of Henry VIII., no other change was made in the form contained in the Roman Pontifical than the omission of the oath to the Pope, which bishops elect had previously been obliged to take. In the reign of Edward VI., the ancient forms were replaced by others, which, with an important addition made to them by the Convocation of 1662, constitute the present ordination service of the Church of England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States. I shall establish the following propositions from which the invalidity of the forms in question may be safely inferred.

First. The change of the form was the act of the civil power, and the forms thus introduced derive their authority from no other source.

Second. The change was made for the purpose of accommodating the rite to the opinions then entertained by the promoters of the English Reformation, and of destroying the notions which, before such change, were attached to the words, priest and bishop.

Third. The change made was such as to leave in the forms no expression of the power of priest and bishop, even in the sense in which these words are taken, by that division of Anglicans who are known to entertain High Church principles, and the form so changed is essentially different from those which are used in Churches, the ordinations of which are regarded as valid.

Fourth. The change of the form, made by Convocation in 1662, is a satisfactory proof of the insufficiency of the form originally devised by Edward VI.

Fifth. The Roman Catholic church has, from the beginning, uniformly condemned the ordinations of the Church of England as invalid, and this rejection is grounded, principally, on the defective form employed in such ordinations.

I. In a Parliament held in the latter part of the year 1549, 3 Edward VI. c. 2, the form of ordination prescribed in the Roman Pontifical was abolished, and the King was empowered to appoint six prelates and six other men of the realm, learned in God's law, to draw up a form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and other ministers of the Church,—which form and none other—was to be used from and after the first of April then next following, (1550). Hence it

appears that it was the State, and not the Church, that changed the form of ordination. True indeed, churchmen were employed by the State on the occasion, because their profession rendered them the most suitable agents the State could find; but this circumstance does not alter the character of the act, which is derived from the power that originated it, and by its sanction gave it the force of law. Thus, it is the State which administers justice, although men of the legal profession are chosen to be its agents; and it is the State which makes war, although it employs military men to carry it on. In each and every of these cases, the State is the power which acts; its ministers appear only in its name, and by virtue of the power delegated to them for the purpose. This is a very different thing from the recognition by the State of the act of an ecclesiastical body, complete in itself, and not necessarily requiring a civil sanction. Nor does the subsequent acceptance of this ordinal by the Convocation alter the state of the case; for such was the servitude entailed on the Church by the first Convocation that acknowledged the Royal Supremacy of Henry VIII. that, until the Church bursts her fetters, by recalling that suicidal act, she is incapable of independent action. "In the language of law," says Dr. Cardwell, "as well as of prerogative the royal pleasure has been considered as the source of all Church authority, and the different bodies that took part with the crown in the enactment of ecclesiastical laws were looked upon as advisers and counsellors to be employed in their respective capacities according to the discretion of the sovereign."*

It is not, then, necessary to inquire what were the private opinions of the six prelates and six other learned men employed by the State on this occasion. Were they entirely orthodox in their sentiments on the subject of orders, they come before us only as servants of the State, and can claim no other than a civil sanction for their proceedings.

Courayer endeavours to leave on his reader's mind the impression, that the ecclesiastics employed in framing the new ordinal, were the same as had in 1548 made some alterations in the public service, which, however otherwise reprehensible, did not involve any departure from Catholic faith; but the number of these was eighteen, and, consequently, the conjecture is not only without

* Documentary Annals of the English Reformed Church, edited by Dr. Edward Cardwell, Principal of St. Alban's College, Oxford. 1839. Preface.

proof, but against evidence. Dr. Heylin supposes them to have been the same as those who were charged with the preparation of the first liturgy of Edward VI., a work declared by Parliament to be a work of the Holy Ghost, and shortly after suppressed by the same respectable standard of Anglican orthodoxy; but the only ground for such an opinion is, that in each instance, the number of State agents employed was twelve.* It is, moreover, certain that two of those who were charged with preparing the first reformed Anglican liturgy, namely the Bishop of Chichester and Winchester, opposed the motion in Parliament for the new ordinal; and we may safely affirm that Cranmer, the prime mover in all these innovations, would not have embarrassed himself by calling them to assist in its preparation. But, as already observed, who they were, or what were their sentiments on the subject of orders, are inquiries but accidentally affecting the character of their work, which was purely an act of the state. In a word, the Parliament originated the proposal for a change of ordinal, and gave its sanction, by anticipation, to such a one as the persons to be named by the King should devise. The King named the framers of the new form. The Church, as a distinct and independent power, acting freely in a matter so entirely appertaining to her, nowhere appears in the transaction.

II. The design of the State in making this change, may be inferred, both from the principles which are known to have then influenced the promoters of the English Reformation, and from the acts which emanated from the sovereign. We have already seen (chapter II.) the change which the innovations of Henry VIII. caused in the character of the English bishops. Although nothing was done to alter the form of consecration, their recognition of the king as the fountain of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, their consenting to take out commissions from him to exercise their functions during his good pleasure, and their compliance with his permissions to consecrate churches, hold ordinations, and perform other acts of the ministry IN HIS STEAD, all show that they must be considered rather as "ecclesiastical sheriffs" than as ministers of the Church.†

* "It is right, however, to remark that, with the exception of Heath, who opposed his colleagues, and was consequently imprisoned, we know none of the persons engaged in the compilation of the ordinal. Heylin's conjecture, (82,) that they were the same individuals who had drawn up the liturgy, is utterly without foundation.—See Strype's Cranmer, 192; and Burnet, II., 136;" Tierney, in Dodd, II., app. cccix.

† Heylin, c. II., p. 29.

Henry had only begun the work of reformation, which it was the chief object of the guilty men who directed the councils of his son, King Edward, to promote. It is beyond all question, that these men, among whom Somerset, the Protector, and Cranmer, the unprincipled tool of every tyrant that did not disdain to employ him, were the most distinguished, were imbued with the principles, and under the influence, of the Continental Reformers. Among the first acts of Edward's reign, was that by which the election of bishops was abolished. They were thenceforward to be made by letters patent, in which the king "named, made, ordained, created, declared, and constituted bishops."* The processes of the ecclesiastical courts, theretofore in the bishop's name, were to be thenceforward in that of the king's, whose seal, *with the bishop's attestation*, was to be appended to them. "The intent of the contrivers of this act," says Dr. Heylin, as already quoted, "was by degrees to weaken the episcopal order, by forcing them from their strong hold of divine institution, and making them no other than the king's ministers only, his ecclesiastical sheriffs, to execute his will and dispense his mandates."

Ten days after his accession to the throne, Edward issued a commission to Cranmer to execute the office of an archbishop, giving him leave to confer orders, etc., and empowered him to act in his (the king's) stead. On 21 Feb., 1547, the king issued orders to him for pulling down images, which order the pliant Primate communicates to his suffragans "in the place, and by the authority, and in the name of the King's Majesty, which we, in this respect, represent."† Among the injunctions addressed by him "to all deans, archdeacons, parsons, vicars, and other ecclesiastical persons," are directions to remove all candles from churches, except two lights upon the high altar before the sacrament; a command to the clergy to procure the Paraphrase of Erasmus, and to study it; directions to them how confessions are to be heard in Lent; how to deal with the sick and dying; and a dispensation, in certain cases, from the divine office. On the fourth of the following May, the king inhibited the bishops from visiting their dioceses, it being his intention to visit them himself; (he was then

* Nominamus, facimus, ordinamus, creamus, declaramus, constituimus episcopum.

† Regiæ majestatis vice et nomine quibus in hac parte fungimur.—Wilkins, IV., 22; apud Lewis, p. 34.

ten years old!) The Bible itself was made subservient to this design of exalting the royal power. Ward says: "In the latter end of King Henry VIII., and in Edward VI. times, they translated 1 Peter, c. ii. v. 13, 'submit yourselves unto all manner of ordinance of man, whether it be unto king, *as to the chief head*, etc.'"* The word "bishop" was replaced in the English Bible by that of "overseer;"† and that this new word was intended to convey a different idea, is evident from the change itself, as well as from the letters patent of this same King Edward VI. to John a Lasco, a Polish sectarist, whom he made "overseer" or bishop of a Calvinist congregation in London. These facts justify the conclusion that the State, in changing the form of ordination, designed to render it more conformable to the change it had effected, or designed to effect, in the relation which bishops bore to the flocks committed to them, as well as to the State, from which, in the new system, they were supposed to derive their powers. This conclusion will be confirmed by an examination of the new form of ordination "devised" by King Edward, and substituted for that which had been used in the Church of England from the time when Augustin announced the Gospel to the pagan Saxons.

III. That the unprofessional reader may more easily understand the subject, which is now to be investigated, it is necessary to state that, in the language of theologians, every sacrament has two parts,—which are called "matter" and "form:" and that the "form," taken in this sense, consists ordinarily of the words which accompany the act, or other matter. Thus in baptism, the *act* of washing with water is the matter;—the words "I baptize thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," are the form of that sacrament. In ordination the matter is, we will for the moment suppose, the imposition of hands—which both Catholics and Anglicans regard as an essential act in the rite of ordination: the form, the words which accompany, or are immediately connected with, this act, and which are spoken by the bishop who confers orders. Sometimes the whole ceremony is called the "form of ordination;" but I shall, on the present occa-

* Errata, pp. 52, 53.

† It is no answer to say that such is the meaning of the Greek word, from which "bishop" is derived. A bishop is an overseer; but the terms are not convertible; and nothing more clearly shows the design of the English Reformers to depreciate the office of bishop, than the substitution of a word never before applied to that office, and which presents nothing but a vague, not to say unworthy, idea.

sion, use the word "form" only in the sense I have above explained.

The nature of the changes made in the ordination service, and the grounds of the exceptions taken to it, by the Catholics of Queen Mary's time, are thus detailed by Dodd:—

"When this ordinal" (that of Edward VI.) "was examined, in the next ensuing reign of Queen Mary, it was declared to be insufficient and invalid, as to the purposes of consecrating a true ministry, both the bishops and parliament being of that opinion. The reasons, in general, of its insufficiency, were an essential defect, both as to the matter and form of the episcopal and sacerdotal orders. There was no anointing—a ceremony always made use of the earliest times, without which the ordination was doubted, and, according to the common opinion, invalid. There was no porrection of instruments, another significative ceremony, generally esteemed to be essential. But, what was still of the greatest moment, there was no form of words, specifying the order that was conferred; and particularly no words or ceremony made use of to express the power of absolving and offering sacrifice. For these, and several other reasons, which I have distinctly mentioned in another place, all the orders conferred according to this new ordinal, were looked upon by the Catholics in Queen Mary's reign, to be null and invalid."*

Although it is no part of the present investigation to establish the sacrificial character of the Eucharist, yet as some of the argumentation which follows, is grounded on the supposition that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, it is necessary to state that a large body of Anglican divines, especially those who admit the necessity of apostolic succession, maintain that the Eucharist is a 'sacrifice,' and that its ministers are properly called 'priests.' I shall give, in the language of an Anglican bishop, Overall, what may be regarded as the exposition of the sentiments of this class of English protestants.—"As there never was, nor could be, any religion without a God, so there never was, nor could be any without a sacrifice, being one of the chiefest acts whereby we profess our religion to Him that we serve."† Another divine of the Anglican communion, Buckeridge, thus expresses the same truth, as also the necessary relation which exists between a priesthood and a sacrifice.

* Dodd. II., 37.

† Overall; Oxford Tracts, Vol. IV., Tract 81, p. 73. London edition.

"This sacrament," says he, "is the only proper external sacrifice of the Church, without which the other two relatives cannot stand; viz: that there is no religion without priesthood, nor priesthood without sacrifice."*

The power of offering sacrifice is what essentially constitutes the character of priest. A deacon may baptize, preach the word, and, in certain cases, *administer* the Sacrament of the Eucharist, although he cannot *consecrate* it. Some modern Anglicans, following the footsteps of many who lived in the seventeenth century, admit, as already said, the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, and, indeed, otherwise, they could not, consistently with the propriety of language, call themselves priests, as they occasionally do. Other divines of the same communion deny this, and regard the Eucharist merely as a commemoration of Christ's sacrifice, without attributing to it any sacrificial character.

Without examining the relative merits of these opinions, it is sufficient to draw attention to the fact, that the Eucharist is never called a sacrifice, either in the Thirty-nine Articles of Queen Elizabeth, or in the second book of *Common Prayer*, published in King Edward's reign, in which it is merely termed the 'Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion,' which would be quite an inappropriate title, had the framers of this service regarded it as a sacrifice. In one of the prayers that follow the communion, the service is indeed called a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,' and our souls and bodies are presented 'to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice;' but, no where is the word sacrifice clearly connected with, or referred to, the Eucharist. I speak of the *English Common Prayer* book; because in the American book of Common Prayer, with many other changes, there is a prayer, ('The oblation') introduced immediately after the words of consecration, in which bread and wine are called "holy gifts," and the prayer above referred to as *following* the the communion is made to precede it, and is incorporated with it. This appears to have been done to supply the defect of any allusion to sacrifice; but the English Prayer Book is still without any word indicating the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Indeed, there is no necessity of going into further proofs on this subject, since a writer in the 'Tracts for the Times,' admits, that in the

* Buckeridge; Discourse concerning kneeling at the Communion; Oxford Tracts, Vol. IV., Tract 81, p. 87.

second book of Edward VI., which, without any alterations on this subject, has been in use in England ever since,—"the *whole* doctrine of the Eucharist was altered."*

The articles, prayer book and catechism—so far at least as they are intelligible,—may be taken as the exposition of the sentiments entertained by those who framed them; and these sentiments were evidently unfavourable to acknowledging a power of offering sacrifice as essential to the priestly character. The word 'altar' was disused, and disappeared entirely from the liturgy in the book of common prayer, where, even now, it is not to be found. The Scriptures themselves were perverted, to remove every thing like a sanction of the idea of a Christian sacrifice. Thus, to give but two instances; St. Paul says, in the 1 Cor. ix. 13, (King James's version) "they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar;" and 1 Cor. x. 18—"are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?"—In both these instances, in Cranmer's bible, published in 1541, the word 'temple' is put instead of 'altar;' a manifest corruption, as the present authorized version sufficiently shows. Ward says:—"To translate 'temple' instead of 'altar,' is so gross a corruption, that had it not been done thrice immediately within two chapters, one would have thought it had been done through oversight, and not on purpose. The name of altar both in Hebrew and Greek, and by the custom of all people, both Jews and Pagans, implies and imports a sacrifice. We, therefore, with respect to the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood, say altar, rather than table; as all the ancient Fathers were accustomed to speak and write; though with respect to eating and drinking Christ's body and blood, it is called a table. But because Protestants will have a communion of bread and wine, or a supper, and no sacrifice; therefore, they call it table only, and abhor the word 'altar' as papistical."† Whitaker,

* Oxford Tracts, p. 17.

† Ward's Errata to the Protestant Bible, Nos. 77, 78.—The following entry appears in King Edward's journal: "Nov. 19. There were letters sent to every bishop to pluck down the altars."—Burnet, II., p. 2; apud Cardwell, Vol. 1, p. 89. Ridley, Bishop of London, in 1550, issued orders throughout his diocese, "that no minister do counterfeit the *Popish Mass*, in kissing the *Lord's board*. That the form of a table may more move and turn the simple from the old superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass, and to the right use of the Lord's Supper, we exhort the curates, church wardens, and questmen here present, to erect and set up the Lord's board after the form of an *honest table decently covered*." The Convocation of 1571, ordered wooden tables for the communion. In the same year Grin-

expressly says:—"There are no priests now in the church of Christ."* And he explains himself further, a few pages afterwards:—"This name priest is never in the New Testament peculiarly applied to the ministers of the Gospel."† And another divine of the Church of England, Pilkinton, says:—"There are now no priests properly so called; because the eucharist is not properly a sacrifice." Hence in the English version of the Bible since the Reformation the word πρεσβυτερος, in the New Testament, has been translated 'elder,' as the word επισκοπος 'overseer.'‡

The doctrine of the Church of England on the subject of sacrifice, at the time when the form of ordination was changed, may be seen from White's 8th Dissertation on the Eucharist, in a section, with this title, "Of another errour, held by some Protestants."§—"The errour referred to, is that the doctrine of the eucharist involves the being therein a real or material sacrifice; an altar; and a priest, in the sense of an offerer of sacrifice."‖ The bishop denies that the term 'sacrifice' is ever applied in the pages of the New Testament, to the commemorating of the death of Christ in the eucharist.¶ He maintains the distinction between 'table' and 'altar;' because, "an altar is a place of sacrifice; and the taking of its name carries by implication, an assumption

dall, Archbishop of York, issued the following, among other injunctions, to his diocese:—"That for the ministration of the communion bread, they should not deliver it unto the people into their mouths but into their hands. All altars to be pulled down to the ground, and the altar stones to be defaced, and be bestowed to some common use."—Burnet's Hist. Ref., Vol. II., Records, Bk. I., No. 52; apud Lewis.

* Whitaker adversus Camp., p. 200. † P. 210.

‡ The writer of the preface to the fourth edition of Ward's Errata of the Protestant Bible, in answer to Dr. Ryan's defence of the above mis-translation, on the plea that "elder was a more literal translation of the Greek word than priest, and presbytery than priesthood," says: "He will allow me to ask, what kind of men they were whom the sacred writers designate by the term πρεσβυτεροι? Were they not ministers of religious worship, ordained for that purpose by the apostles? As a minister of the Established Church, he must answer in the affirmative. But if they were, what is the proper term by which such ministers are described in the English language? Not only common usage, but the very language of the Church of England, decides in favour of the word priest. If, then, the translators of the Bible meant to speak a language intelligible to their readers, they ought to have translated the Greek word '*priests*,' and not *elders*. Were I to request the favour of Dr. Ryan, to translate the following Latin sentence: 'Episcopus Londinensis cum majore civitatis et duobus ecclesiæ presbyteris visitavit universitatem Oxoniensem,'—would he prefer as more literal, such a version as this: The overseer of London, with the greater of the city, and two elders of the church, visited the generality of Oxford?"—P. 5, Phila. ed.

§ Lectures on the Catechism, by Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia. ‖ P. 389. ¶ 391.

of its distinguishing property;"* but he admits that they may be used, one for the other, and just as every church may be said to be a house, so every altar may be said to be a table; but as every house is not a church, so neither every table is not an altar.†—"What the primitive church meant by eucharistic oblation," says he, "may be seen in the rubricks of the Episcopal Church, where she makes the 'offertory to *begin* with the collecting of the alms and other devotions of the people.' The sentiment is supposed to have come down to us from the earliest times, in which the oblation began with popular contributions; and it was not perfected, until what had been thus gathered were presented at the Lord's table, in a solemn act of adoration. And this was done by the minister in the name of all."‡—"What she (the Episcopal Church) understands by 'oblation,' has been already shown by a reference to the rubrick before the reading of the sentences. And as to the term 'sacrifice,' the only places in which it appears in any of her institutions, with a reference to the eucharist, is in the prayer of consecration; where it is said—'We offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto thee;' and again;—'Although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this, our bounden duty and service.'

"Throughout the order for the communion, the word 'table' is used always: the word 'altar,' never.

"In order to perceive the sense of the word 'priest,' in the institutions of the Church of England, it is proper to take into view her Latin book of common prayer; which is confessedly the document of paramount authority. This book uniformly makes use of the Latin word answering to a Christian minister,§ and not that answering to an offerer of sacrifice.‖ This shows, that she considers the word 'priest,' as the original Greek word, accommodated with an English termination. And yet, the reformers had found the other Latin word transmitted to them in the religious services of their predecessors. But they perceived it to be a verbal intrusion, intimately allied to very dangerous error.

"Here then is decisive evidence, that the sentiments sustained in the present discussion were those of the Church of England in

* P. 392. † 392. ‡ 396. § Presbyter, (elder.) ‖ Sacerdos.

the reign of Edward VI., when the liturgy was reformed. That it so continued in the reign of Elizabeth, there needs no better evidence, than that of the sagacious Hooker; who writes as follows—'Seeing that sacrifice is now no part of the church ministry; how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied?'* This he states in the form of an objection on the part of his opponent. Hooker's answer is—'Surely, even as St. Paul applieth the name of flesh unto that very substance of fishes, which hath a proportionable correspondence to flesh, although it be in nature another thing; whereupon, when philosophers will speak warily, they make a difference between flesh in one sort of living creatures, and that other substance in the rest, which hath but a kind of analogy to flesh; the apostle contrarywise, having matter of greater importance whereof to speak, nameth indifferently both flesh. The fathers of the church, with like security of speech, call usually the ministry of the gospel a priesthood, in regard of that which the gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices; namely, the communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although it hath properly now no sacrifice. As for the people, when they hear the name, it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator or an alderman causeth them to think upon old age; or to imagine, that every one so termed, must needs be ancient, because years were respected in the first nomination of both. Wherefore, to pass by name, let them use what dialect they will: whether we call it a priesthood, a presbytership, or a ministry, it availeth not; although in truth, the word presbyter doth seem most fit, and in propriety of speech more agreeable than priest, with the drift of the whole gospel of Jesus Christ.' "

Further on, Bishop White says:—"In the course of the discussion it has been acknowledged that the here supposed errors concerning 'Sacrifice,' 'Altars,' and 'Priest,' arose at an early period of the Christian church. In England the doctrine which has been argued against, *was completely put down at the Reformation.* If, in later times, the notion has been entertained by some of the clergy of the Church of England, it has not crept into her public institutions.

"Archbishop Laud, and the ruling churchmen of his day, have

* Book V., sec. 78.

been accused of endeavours to restore the very system against which this section is directed. Doubtless, the belief of the existence of such a design, contributed to the disorders of that period, and to the temporary downfall of the established Church: and the apprehension of danger was much countenanced by some practices attempted to be introduced, without any authority of the Rubricks, particularly bowing towards the altar.

"But that the persons now contemplated did not carry their designs to an extent inconsistent with the principles here maintained, appears in the unequivocal fact, that in preparing a liturgy for the Church of Scotland, for 'Priest' they put 'Presbyter,' which accordingly is still found in the said liturgy. The above fact is stated by the learned Selden, in his treatise 'De Synod. Vet. Hebræorum.'* Be it, as Selden intimates, that this was done *to reconcile the Scotch to an unpopular measure.* Still, the agents were not so indiscreet as to forfeit all pretensions to consistency in their religious system. If there should be alleged the cotemporary zeal manifested to change the position of the Communion Tables; the reason assigned, was to prevent an irreverent use of them; and the point pressed was, not to make altars, but to place the tables where the altars formerly stood."—p. 402, 403.

In all that I have said or quoted concerning sacrifice, I have not proposed to prove that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, but merely to state, in the language of an unexceptionable witness, the doctrine of the Church of England on that subject, during the reign of Edward VI.; neither do I undertake to show that the ministers of the New Law are properly called "priests," or that the word "altar" is appropriately applied to that portion of the christian temple usually designated by the term. I have endeavoured to show that the English Reformers, in the reign of Edward VI., denied the Eucharist to be a sacrifice, and consequently denied that there were such things as priests and altars. This appears to me incontrovertibly proved by the single circumstance of their alteration of the Sacred Text, and by their omission of all mention of sacrifice in the Communion service, and articles of Religion. Hence, it is easy to account for the omission of all mention of the power to offer sacrifice, or of the priestly character, in the form devised by King Edward, for the ordination of priests. This form I here insert.

* Vol. III., lib. 1, p. 408.

"Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and of his holy sacraments. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

Now there is nothing here that a deacon may not do; as the remission of sin, of which the form speaks, does not, in the Protestant interpretation, necessarily include the idea of priestly absolution. This form is, then, insufficient: it does not express the nature of the power conferred, and this is an essential defect.

If Edward's form for ordaining priests was defective, as it most certainly was, it need scarcely be said that the order of bishop, were the form of episcopal consecration faultless, cannot be conferred on those who have been ordained according to it. The episcopacy is but the plenitude of the priesthood; and, according to the general sentiment of divines, cannot be conferred except on such as are previously priests.* But besides this radical defect in the Anglican episcopal consecration, the form of ordaining a bishop is, in itself, defective. It differs in no essential thing from that of priests.

This form, as used previous to 1662, is as follows:—

"Take thou the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness."

Is there any thing in this to signify the office and character of a bishop? Might not the same formula be made use of, as Dr. Milner has well remarked, in laying hands on children? Indeed, it does not contain a word which might not be addressed, by way of exhortation, to one who had received confirmation. Hence, the form of consecrating a bishop is insufficient, because it contains nothing indicative and distinctive of the character of a bishop. "In nothing else," says Dr. Milner, "does Cranmer's spirit of Presbyterianism appear so plain as in his form of ordaining bishops."

In reply to these arguments, it is said, that, with regard to the form of consecrating priests, although the word "priest" is not

* Impossibile est ordinari episcopum, qui antea non sit presbyter, vel certe non tunc accipiat utramque ordinationem; quia utraque est de essentia episcopatus.—Bellarmine, Lib. De Sacram. Ord., c. 5.

found in Edward's form, it occurs no less than four times in the ordination ceremony; that this must be taken as *one* act, and that the meaning of the form is to be determined by all that precedes and follows it, and by the general and avowed tendency of the whole ceremony. It would follow from this, that the wording of the form is a matter of perfect indifference. If an insufficient form of baptism were employed in the administration of that sacrament, it would be of no avail; although it might have been frequently intimated in the preceding and subsequent part of the ceremony, that the child, or other person, was presented for baptism.*

It is said, in reply, that if the Eucharist be a sacrifice, as many learned Protestants maintain, "the words used in the Anglican form, empowering the candidate to minister the holy sacraments, are sufficient to confer that of offering sacrifice." This I deny; because, there is nothing in the public acts, or liturgy of the English Church, to show that the Eucharist is regarded as a sacrifice by the Church, whatever may be the opinion of some members of her communion. Moreover, the changes made seem purposely to have been "devised" in order to exclude such an idea. Whether the Anglican Church regards the Eucharist as a sacrifice or not, there is not the slightest trace of such a power being conferred in the aforesaid form of ordination.

It is a principle with Catholics, that no error about the nature or efficacy of a Sacrament, no positive disbelief of its divine institution, or any other personal unworthiness on the part of him who administers it, can deprive such a sacrament of its effect,—provided sufficient matter, valid form, and due intention, concur in its administration. But if the matter be omitted, or curtailed of any essential part; if the form be vitiated; or if ambiguity be introduced, for the purpose of introducing error; it is no longer a valid means of producing sacramental effects. Now, it is beyond all controversy, that the form of priestly ordination was changed under Edward VI., and couched in the vague manner above explained, for the purpose of introducing, or, at least, sanctioning, the erroneous principle, that the Eucharist is no sacrifice,—that

* "It is true, naming the person and office in the preamble, declares the design; but it does not prove the fact, or actual collation of the power. We have a parallel case in the sacrament of baptism. The previous ceremonies and prayers give us the person's name, with the conditions of the engagements, and character of a Christian; but unless the divine institution be observed as to the matter and form, baptism cannot have its proper effect."—Dodd, II., App. cccvii.

presbyters are not priests—sacerdotes—in the proper signification of the term,—and that the doctrines which had for so many ages prevailed in the English Church on these subjects, are blasphemous fables.* It is equally undeniable, that the ancient form of episcopal consecration was set aside, and a new one of the most vague character introduced, for the purpose of bringing down the episcopal body to a level with the second order of the clergy; —a purpose, which, according to Burnet's own showing, it answered so well, that it was, on this account, amended in 1662. Cranmer was the chief person engaged in changing the form; and in the evidence of his presbyterian propensities, given in chapter II., we have the best means of removing any ambiguity that might be about the form, if, indeed, any doubt existed as to its meaning. Courayer endeavoured to evade the difficulty arising from the well known sentiments of those who framed the present form. To prove that Cranmer and Barlow, whom he supposes to be the bishop of St. David's, did not succeed in their efforts to make the form as presbyterian as they would have wished, he says that they were opposed, and their judgments overruled by their brother bishops; and in proof of this, he brings forward the sentiments of several of those bishops, who, he supposes, were concerned in the composition of the Ritual. It has been already shown, that we are not acquainted with the persons composing the Commission for framing the new ordinal. We only know that Heath, Archbishop of York, was one of them, and that he was imprisoned for opposing the change made in the ancient form.

The ancient ordinals are appealed to, as a proof "that imposition of hands, and a prayer suitable to the order conferred is undoubtedly all that is essentially requisite in ordination."† Does not our objection to the form consist in a denial that there is in it, any prayer expressing the nature of the order conferred? The ancient ordinals prove nothing, unless they contain forms as vague and as insufficient, as those devised by Edward VI. Such forms, however, are only to be found in *one* liturgy—the book of Common Prayer.‡

Mr. Williams, in his answer to Ward, dwells on some ceremo-

* This is the expression applied to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Mass, in the 30th of Queen Elizabeth's thirty-nine articles of religion.

† Williams, Ch. II.

‡ See copious extracts from ancient ordinals in the Appendix, XVI.

nies of the Catholic ordination, as if we regarded them as essential; but without attaching importance to any thing else than what he himself has laid down, as 'essentially requisite in ordination,'—imposition of hands, and a prayer suitable to the order conferred, Catholics can show that the Anglican form, devised by Edward, is insufficient; and, were it necessary, can prove that their own forms contain all that is required. This, however, is not denied by the Anglican writers who profess to derive their orders from us.

The most plausible argument adduced by him in support of the form of Edward VI., is its substantial identity with the form which, according to him, is prescribed in the Roman Pontifical. Were this, indeed, the case, all objections to the ordinations of the Anglican Church, grounded on the insufficiency of the form of Edward VI., must be given up. To sustain this position, Williams adduces what he calls our form for priests.

"Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained."

To prove that this form is acknowledged by us as the form of ordination, he refers to the Council of Trent, Sess. 23, Can. IV., in which it is said: "If any body shall assert that the Holy Ghost is not given in holy orders, and consequently that the bishops say in vain: 'Receive the Holy Ghost;' let him be anathematized." The authority of Cardinal Bellarmine is also adduced, who is said to maintain that the grace of the Holy Ghost is given to the candidate for priesthood, when it is said to him: "Receive the Holy Ghost." This, however, is a mistake. The Council did not define, or in any way declare, that the form of conferring the Holy Ghost was these words: "Receive," &c., but only that the Holy Ghost is imparted in ordination—and, consequently, that the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," are verified; without, however, saying—much less defining—that these words constitute the form of ordination. This the Council could not have done, as it is certain that the imperative form, "Receive the Holy Ghost," etc. was not observed for many ages in the Church.

In the passage referred to by Williams, Bellarmine proves that the imposition of hands is essential to ordination: he treats only incidentally of the form; and although he seems to regard the words "Receive the Holy Ghost," as *part* of the form, he does not regard it as the *whole* form;—the words, "Receive the power

of offering sacrifice, as well for the living as for the dead," being, according to him, no less essential to ordination than the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost."* Whatever may be thought of this opinion, it is certainly unfavourable to the form devised by Edward VI., in which there is no mention of offering sacrifice; and it is obviously unfair to quote Bellarmine's authority, without giving his entire opinion.

Not to involve the general reader in a theological investigation, it is sufficient to state,—what is admitted by Courayer and Williams,—that the supposed form "Receive the Holy Ghost," "was not observed for many ages in the primitive Church."† As this is a point which, of itself, destroys the identity sought to be established between the forms of Edward VI., and those described in the Roman Pontifical, I shall quote from an unexceptionable writer the authorities by which it is sustained. "These words," says Chardon, "which are found in the Roman Pontifical, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, etc., (Receive the Holy Ghost, etc.), in which many scholastics imagined they found the form of ordination, are not ancient; for even the earliest scholastics, such as Hugh of St. Victor, Alexander Hales, William of Auxerre, St. Bonaventura, and St. Thomas, make no mention of them, although they treat minutely of the rites of ordination.—Neither is it found in Latin Rituals of more than four hundred years antiquity, nor even in many modern rituals, as Father Morinus remarks.‡ The Greeks and Syrians to this day, have no such form. Many scholastics, however, believed them to be essential; because they imagined that the forms of the sacraments ought to be imperative. But now this opinion no longer prevails, no more than other sentiments of the schools regarding the sacraments. There are few theologians who do not teach that the matter and form of ordination consists in the imposition of the bishop's hands and in the invocation of

* Bellarmine, De Sacr. Ordinis., Lib. 1, C. IX.

† Succession of Protestant Bishops Asserted. Chapter II.

‡ Nulli rituales antiqui hæc habent verba, nusquam comparent; etiam in recentioribus multis nulla eorum mentio. Apud Latinos coepta sunt usurpari vix ab annis quadringentis, apud Græcos autem et Syros nec est, nec unquam fuit, illorum usus. Itaque nulla ratione dici possunt ad ordinis substantiam pertinere. Morinus, De Sacris Ordinationibus, pars 3, exercit. 2, Cap. 2, p. 22.

Verba illa, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, quæ ante prædictam præfationem, cum manus impositione, ab ipso consecratore proferuntur, in quibus formam episcopatus reponunt scholastici recentiores, toti antiquitati ignota fuerunt: adeo ut vix in ullo Pontificali annos quadringentos attingente reperiantur.—Martene, De Antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus, lib. 1, cap. 8, Art. 10, p. 330.

the Holy Ghost, although all agree with the Council of Trent, that the bishop who ordains, does not in vain say:—Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, etc."*

It may be asked, in what does that part of the rite of ordination, prescribed in the Roman Pontifical, and which is called the 'form,' consist? As far as the present controversy is concerned, I might decline the question. This is a very different reply from that which Mr. Evans attributes to me, and in which I appear to avow my incapacity to point out the form in the Roman Pontifical. Again I reply, I am not obliged to point it out; as it is enough for me to have shewn that it is *not* the words "Receive the Holy Ghost, etc." as the objection I am answering supposes. I shall however, observe that as the Church has not defined what part of the ceremony of ordination is that called the 'form,' theologians have enjoyed on this subject a speculative freedom of opinion, which does not at all interfere with the observance of the whole rite prescribed in the Roman Pontifical.

Having premised this, I shall state the opinion which appears best sustained by argument; namely, that the form of ordination consists in the prayer which accompanies the second imposition of hands in the ceremony of ordaining priests, and the prayer "Propitiare" in that for the consecration of bishops. As it is not my object to defend this opinion, but merely to state it, and, thereby, show that the supposed similarity between the form of our Pontifical, and that of Edward VI., is not established; and, consequently, that the argument derived therefrom is inconclusive, I shall merely give, in a note, sufficient evidence that this opinion is maintained by great names in theology.†‡

* Chardon, Histoire des Sacremena. Liv. I., De L'Ordre, c. 8.

† "Sententia quam tenent Martene, Becanus, Tournellius, Juvenin, Petrocorus, Concina, et alii cum S. Bonaventura, cui adhæret Benedictus XIV., vult utramque potestatem (nempe sacrificium offerendi et absolvendi) Sacerdoti conferri per secundam impositionem manuum, nempe cum Episcopus extendit manus super ordinandum unà cum Presbyteris assistentibus, sicut declaratur à Trid., sess. 14, c. 3, De Pœnit.—Quænam autem sit forma juxta hanc sententiam, alii dicunt esse verba:—*Accipe Potestatem*, etc. Sed forte probabilius dicunt Morinus et Tournellius esse orationem quam recitat Episcopus in præfata impositione; et verba quæ recitat in fine in tertia manuum impositione, accipe 'Spiritum Sanctum,' esse *dicunt tantum declarativa Spiritus sancti jam accepti*. Hæc tertia sententia est probabilior."—Homo Apostolicus Sti Alphonso de Ligorio. Tract XVII., De Extrema Unctione et Ordine. The same opinion is maintained by Selvagius, Antiquitat. Christ. Inst. Lib. III., Cap. XIV., § 7. And by Van Espen, Juris Eccles. Univ., pars. I., Tit. XV., C. III., xiii., De consecratione Episcoporum.

‡ Mr. Evans entirely mis-states the reply I gave in my former work, to the

Bishop Bramhall says, that although there is nothing in the English form, no less than in ours (in which latter instance he evidently mistakes our form,) "which doth distinctly and reciprocally express episcopal power and authority, yet that taken in connexion with the whole ceremony,—in which the candidate is seven times stated to be about to be consecrated a bishop,—it fully expresses the nature of the episcopal office." This objection, like the similar one in regard to the form of priestly ordination, is answered by saying, that unless the form express the nature of the character it is intended to convey, it is insufficient, and invalidates the act. When a person is about to be baptized, all the preparatories prayers and ceremonies sufficiently show that such is the object and end of the ceremony: but, as before said, if an insufficient form of baptism be employed, i. e. which does not express the effect intended to be produced by the sacrament, no one will pretend that the sacrament is validly administered. Thus, in the case before us. The words above quoted from the ordinal of Edward VI., must be regarded as the form by which the material sign of the imposition of hands received a determinate signification; or it must be said, that there is no such form in the ceremony. The prayers which precede the passages cited, recognize that the person on whose behalf they are offered, has not yet been ordained; while those which follow no less clearly imply that he has been ordained. "Whoever," says Dr. Fletcher, "weighs all the words which are made use of in the administration of the sacred rite, (in Edward's ordinal) whether those which precede the above or those which follow them, will feel convinced that there is not any thing in either of them to which it is possible to attach the grace and virtue of consecration. The words which precede the above, (Take the Holy Ghost, etc.) imply manifestly that the individual, upon whom the solemn action is now performing, is not yet consecrated. The words which follow them, just as obviously imply, that he is now consecrated; in short, if there be any thing in the aforesaid ordinal that constitutes the form, and can be supposed to communicate the character,

objection, that the words, "Receive the Holy Ghost," were recognized as the form in the Roman Pontifical. The contrary is very abundantly evident. I did not say that the validity of the ordinations depends on adhering to every part of the rite ascribed in the Roman Pontifical, as Mr. Evans says; who, confounding things that are obviously distinct, does the very thing he lays to my charge, and sometimes takes the word "form" in its narrower or larger sense as occasion requires.

of the episcopal order, it is, beyond all doubt, comprised in the terms just cited: 'Take the Holy Ghost,' &c."*

IV. The conclusion to which an examination of King Edward's Ordinal leads us, is confirmed by what may, not unfairly, be regarded as a tacit avowal of the English Church, that these forms of ordination were defective. In the year 1662, while the Convocation of the clergy was sitting, a learned convert from Protestantism, the Rev. John Lewgar, (*Erastus Senior*) published a tract on the ordination controversy, in which he argued powerfully against the vague form of ordination, which had been, up to that time, used in the Anglican ordinations. These objections turned principally on the point, that there was nothing in the form of consecrating bishops, which expressed the office or character of the episcopacy: and that the form of the ordination of priests omitted what was the essence of the priestly character—the power of offering sacrifice. Whether, in consequence of his reasons, or from a general conviction of the defectiveness of the form theretofore used, or, as Bishop Burnet affirms, to meet the objections of the Presbyterians; certain it is, that the Convocation CHANGED the form which had been used for upwards of one hundred years; and that the change, especially in regard to the episcopal consecration, was precisely such as might be deemed sufficient to supply the defect charged upon it. This is seen by comparing the forms of Edward VI., with those adopted by the Convocation in 1662. The italics mark the additions now made to the original form.

The form of ordaining priests made by the Convocation after the restoration of King Charles II., in 1662.

"Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands.* Whose sins thou shalt forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of his holy sacraments, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

* Comparative View of the Grounds of the Catholic and Protestant Churches. By the Rev. John Fletcher, D.D. London, 1826.—"It is not here the place to enter into the question of the validity of the orders conferred by the new ordinal; it will be sufficient to observe that it was composed principally by men who considered ordination an unnecessary rite—and that no form of words was preserved significative of the orders conferred."—Waterworth, p. 196.

The form of consecrating bishops made in the same year, 1662.

"Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God, committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands; in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness."

With regard to these two forms I have to remark that the changes of 1662 evidently *aim* at supplying the defect pointed out by Catholic divines: whether they do so, or not, need not be inquired.

It requires no argument to prove that such a change, made in such circumstances, is equivalent to a tacit avowal of the insufficiency of the form which had been used, during the first century of the Anglican Church: and it is curious to observe the embarrassment of the advocates of Anglican orders in reconciling this proceeding of the Convocation with the sufficiency of Edward's form. The cause of the change, says Williams, was not to meet the objections of the Catholics, but to silence the complaints of some "ignorant presbyterians, who took occasion to comfort themselves with the validity of their own ordinations, because that in our" (Anglican) "ordinals they did not find any positive distinction made between a bishop and a priest."* The authority of Bishop Burnet is adduced in support of this assertion. "There was then (that is in King Edward's times, etc.) no express mention made in the words of ordaining them, that it was for one or the other: in both it was said: 'Receive the Holy Ghost, in the name of the Father,' &c. But that having been since made use of, to prove both functions the same, it was of late years altered, as it is now. Nor were these words, being the same in giving both orders, any ground to infer that the Church esteemed them one order, the rest of the office showing the contrary very plainly."†

* The Succession of Protestant Bishops Asserted, c. iii.

† "We have only Dr. Burnet's word that this was the occasion for altering the form. I am apt to think, the alteration was made rather, at the importunity of some members of the Church by law established, who, about that time, were more than usually perplexed with scruples concerning the validity of their orders."—Dodd, II., App. cccvi. Mr. Tierney subjoins the following note: "Constable remarks that it was made immediately after the publication of Lewgar's Erastus Senior, a work which successfully attacked Bramhall's vindication of the Protestant form of ordination."—Remarks on Courayer, 271.

If the forms of Edward were sufficient, the Convocation of 1662 by changing them, especially in those points in which their validity had been assailed, inflicted a wound on the character of English orders, which it will be extremely difficult to heal. If the forms of Edward VI. were not sufficient, the change came one hundred and three years TOO LATE! Whatever opinion be adopted, the validity of English orders has been most seriously compromised by those who should have maintained it.

Mr. Evans says, that, had Convocation regarded the change as necessary for the validity of the ordinations conferred agreeably to this form, it would not only have changed the form, but with equal honesty, have looked around for a new consecration; and hence, he infers, it could not have been so regarded by the Convocation, and, consequently, that this change cannot be urged as an indirect avowal of the essential defectiveness of the form theretofore used. Whether the Convocation regarded the change as essentially necessary, or not, we are not concerned to inquire: the fact that such a change was made, and in such circumstances, supplies an argument of former insufficiency that cannot be disregarded. Whatever may have been the immediate cause of the change, it affords presumptive proof that the original form of episcopal consecration was defective. Nor is this presumption weakened by the motive which Burnet assigns, "that it (the form of episcopal consecration) was for the one or the other:" i. e. that it indicated no distinction between the character of priest and that of bishop.

V. The ordinal of King Edward VI. was condemned in Queen Mary's reign, and the ordinations made according to it have been uniformly rejected as invalid by the Roman Catholic Church. This church, as already stated, does not condemn as invalid the orders of heretical and schismatical societies, except where there is an essential defect, either in the minister who ordains, or the ceremony performed. She rejects the English orders, principally, because conferred according to a defective rite. This is evinced by her practice in Queen Mary's reign, when the only cause of these orders being rejected, was the novel and insufficient character of the form used in their collation. We find that those bishops who had been consecrated according to Edward's form, were regarded as invalidly consecrated; and even their civil acts were annulled by the courts of law, during the reign of Queen Mary.

The Catholic doctors of those times regarded that form as invalid. This was publicly declared by Richard Bristow, in a book written in the year 1567, to which reference has already been made; and it has ever since been the sentiment of the church; which has uniformly considered as mere laymen, whatever bishops, ministers, etc., of the English clergy, have returned to her communion, and confers on them, as such, the orders of priesthood, etc., should they be disposed to embrace the ecclesiastical state. This was at length solemnly ordered by a decree of the Roman Inquisition, made in the presence of Clement XI., on the 27th of April, 1704.

The rejection of English ordinations by the Church, is grounded principally on the insufficiency of the form; and not upon any historical fact, such as whether Mathew Parker was, or was not, consecrated by Barlow, or whether Barlow himself was, or was not, a regularly consecrated bishop. Whatever opinion may be formed on each of these much disputed facts,—and every Catholic is at perfect liberty to affirm or deny them,—the judgment and practice of the Church is founded on the nature of the form, which, being insufficient of itself, suffices to invalidate the act of which it is so essential a part, no matter by whom performed.

Mr. Evans denies that the present practice of the Church of Rome, in ordaining such bishops or ministers of the Anglican Communion as become Catholics, and desire to embrace the ecclesiastical state, has always prevailed; and he asserts that it is grounded more on the supposed historical facts regarding Parker's consecration than on any doctrinal objection to the form. For support of this assertion, he adduces the petition presented by the Roman Inquisition to Clement XI., on behalf of John Clement Gordon, who, before his conversion to the Catholic faith, had been bishop of Galloway, in Scotland. In it the facts of the case are narrated, whether accurately or not, this is not the place to discuss;* but the defective form is also urged among the motives for declaring the Anglican orders invalid. In this petition, it is asserted to have been the uniform practice in England, to regard Anglican ministers, who should reunite themselves to the Church, as mere laymen.† The decrees of the Roman Inquisition,‡ one of the tri-

* See Appendix, XV.

† Denique constans semper in Anglia fuit praxis, ut si quis hæreticorum ministrorum ad gremium revertatur Ecclesiæ, sæcularis instar habeatur.

‡ "The progress of the new opinions awakened the zeal of Paul III., who, in the year 1543, organized a Council of Cardinals, under the title of the Congregation

bunals of the Church, do not, as Mr. Evans imagines, assume the truth of all the facts stated in the memorials presented to it, and with the prayer of which it may judge fit to comply. That its judgment was founded on the defective form, of which such a tribunal could so safely form an estimate, rather than on the truth of the facts connected with this controversy, we have sufficient authority for asserting.*

But it is said, the practice of the Roman Catholic Church has varied on the subject of the ordinations made according to the Ordinal of Edward VI. On the accession of Mary, those who had been ordained or consecrated, according to that ordinal, were received as ministers of the Church, and restored to the exercise of their functions, on conforming to the Catholic Religion. This, it is said, is admitted by Sanders in a passage referred to by Mr. Haddan, it is also proved by Bonner's rehabilitation of Scory in July, 1554; by the 15th among certain articles sent by Mary to Bonner, in March, 1553, compared with the 29th of Bonner's Visitation Articles in 1554, and by the Brief of Julius III. to Cardinal Pole, March 8, 1554, compared with the commissions issued accordingly by the Chapter of Canterbury, and to the several bishops, wherein they are authorized to confirm all clergy in

of the Supreme Inquisition. Six cardinals originally composed it, to whom two more were associated by St. Pius V. They are strictly an ecclesiastical tribunal, charged with the affairs regarding the integrity of faith throughout the world. Hence, doctrinal matters are referred to them for examination, and the orthodoxy of clergymen especially, whose sentiments may be called in question, is decided by their judgment. They determine also the heterodoxy of books, and condemn them in case they discover them to contain error. The Pope is Supreme Inquisitor, as the highest guardian of the faith. The tribunal has no temporal attributions out of the Roman States, and its action within them is very circumscribed, being little more than the injunction of penitential observances, or, in some cases, imprisonment for crimes against religion, in connexion with the order of society. In former times, although very rarely, some executions took place after conviction for heresy, or some kindred crime. The providence of God permitted its archives to fall into the hands of Napoleon, who caused them to be transferred to Paris; but nothing has ever been brought to light to its prejudice, which, as Cardinal Pacca well observes, shows that its proceedings were found unexceptionable."—The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated, by Francis Patrick Kenrick, Bishop of Philadelphia, p. 435, 3d ed. New York, 1848.

* L'histoire de l'Auberge, quoique très bien prouvée, n 'influe en rien dans les décisions de Rome. C'est la nature même de l'Ordination, ce sont les formes du rituel d'Edouard, pour ordonner les diacres, les prêtres et les evêques, qu'on a examinées fort long temps, et dont le défaut a fait déclarer les ordinations invalides et nulles,—*Hardouin;* La Defense refutée, Tom. 1, p. 54. "Il (Edouard) a aboli les vraies formes d'ordinaton et en a substitué de fausses; et c'est à raison de cet attentat, qu'on a depuis réjeté les Ordinations faites selon son nouveau rit."—Le Quien, T. II., p. 26.

their respective orders. These facts are adduced to show that, during Mary's reign, the ordinations made according to Edward's Ordinal were reputed valid. The fact that the Registers of those times contain no entry of re-ordination is relied upon, as a confirmation of the foregoing conclusion.

The passage quoted from Sanders—although Le Quien says it is of Riston, who interpolated that author—is the following. "But in the beginning of the restoration of the Church, the clergy everywhere fell into a grievous error, on occasion of the Queen having given, as already said, permission to exercise the Catholic Religion. Many who had been involved in the schism, during Henry and Edward's times, forgetful of the canons and rules of the Church, without reflecting on their condition, or examining by whom or what bishops, and after what manner they had been ordained,—rashly and irreverently hurried to the altar to offer sacrifice."* It is difficult to see what advantage the advocates of Anglicanism can derive from the inconsiderate conduct here condemned, were it even certain that there could have been no other impediment to the exercise of the functions of the ministry than the want of ordination. During the schism the number of those who had incurred irregularities—ecclesiastical impediments to the exercise of orders—either by receiving orders from schismatic bishops, or otherwise participating in their guilt, must have been far greater than the number of those who had been ordained according to Edward's Ordinal, which became the legal ritual only after the 1st April, 1550—three years before the accession of Mary.

Bonner's rehabilitation of Scory—if authentic—must be understood only of the exercise of the orders which this changeling had received, before the introduction of Edward's Ordinal, unless we suppose that Bonner, in July, 1554, recognized the validity of an ordinal, which he himself, five months before, regarded as invalid, as may be inferred from the 15th of Mary's articles sent to him in the preceding March, and which ordinal he impugned in a work published about this time. Collier quotes from a book written by him, entitled "A profitable and necessary Doctrine, etc.," in which he rigorously censures the ordinal, prepared in the late reign, and denies that it imparts any character. His reason

* Apud Le Quien, T. II., p. 45.

is, that in the reformed ordinal, in the ordination of priests, there is not given the power of offering in the Mass the body and blood of the Saviour.* Hence, we must interpret his rehabilitation of Scory, and the 29th of his visitation articles, in a manner not to involve him in contradiction with himself. The article referred to, as quoted by Mr. Haddan, directs inquiry to be made, "whether any such as were ordered schismatically, and contrary to the old order and custom of the Catholic Church,—*being not yet reconciled nor admitted by the Ordinary*, have celebrated Mass." Unless Bonner acted on other principles than those which influenced the ecclesiastical and civil courts, and even the high court of parliament, as will presently appear, a condition for the reconciliation which he required, was ordination according to the Catholic rite, for those who had received priest's orders according to the form devised by King Edward.

The 15th article in the document addressed by Mary to Bonner, which is adduced to prop up the inference from the visitation article just treated of, is a decisive proof that from the very beginning of her reign, 4th March, 1553, the orders in question were rejected as invalid.

15. "Item, touching such persons as were heretofore promoted to any orders, after the new sort and fashion of orders, considering *they were not ordered in very deed*, the bishop of the diocese, finding otherwise sufficiency and ability in those men, may supply that thing which wanted in them before, and then, according to his discretion, admit them to minister."†

It must appear extraordinary that this article, which so explicitly asserts the invalidity of "the new sort and fashion of orders," should be appealed to in their support. Because the queen tells the bishop to "supply that which was wanted in them before," it is supposed, that there was only question of supplying ceremonies, not essential to ordination; and this, notwithstanding the express declaration, that the persons of whom the article speaks, "were not ordered in very deed." Many of those who had been ordained priests, "after the new sort and fashion of orders," had, doubtless, received the inferior orders according to the ancient rite. It was the defect resulting from the reception of invalid orders which the queen ordered to be supplied. Any other interpretation of the article is preposterous.

* Collier, 2, p. 380; apud Le Quien. † Burnet, II., Records, 229

Neither the Brief of Julius III., nor the commissions issued under it, authorize the assertion, that they recognize implicitly the validity of Edward's ordinal. By them the bishops were authorized to confirm the clergy in their respective orders, "even when they had been received from heretical and schismatical bishops, or irregularly (*minus rite,*) *provided that in their collation the form of the Church and due intention had been observed.*"* By receiving valid orders in schism, as already stated, an irregularity is incurred, by which the exercise of the orders so received is forbidden. This was the object of the brief and commission in question. They did not profess to supply a radical defect, but to remove an accidental one; and hence the exception, excluding from the benefit of this grace the orders in which the form of the church, i. e. the Roman pontifical, had not been observed, which could be no other than the orders conferred "after the new sort and fashion," devised by King Edward.

But there are no registers of re-ordination. Hence, it is inferred, all ordained according to Edward's ordinal were recognized as validly ordained. How many of the comparatively few, ordained according to that ordinal, conformed, or on conforming, were admitted to the ministry, we do not know; but if we have no registry of re-ordination, the cause may be, that the former orders, according to Edward's ordinal, being null and invalid from the beginning, those who had received them were regarded as mere laics, who, when presented for orders were not considered as persons re-ordained, to supply a possible defect in their first reception of orders, but were simply ordained.

The confirmation of benefices and other promotions ecclesiastical, does not, as Dr. Bramhall supposes, imply the ordination of those on whom they had been conferred. Such confirmation leaves the question of orders untouched. Mr. Evans gives a long extract from this writer, in which he endeavours to show, that the words of Cardinal Pole's dispensation, in pursuance of the powers given to him by Julius III., imply a recognition of the King Edward's orders.† He dwells especially on the words, *licet nulliter et de facto*

* Quodque irregularitate et alius præmissis non obstantibus, in suis ordinibus ab hæreticis et schismaticis etiam minus rite, *dummodo in eorum collatione Ecclesiastica forma et intentio sit servata,* susceptis, etiam in altaris ministerio ministrare possint."

† At cum iis qui ecclesias cathedrales et metropolitanas de manu laicorum, etiam schismaticorum, ut præfertur, receperunt, quod eisdem, seu aliis, ad quas eas per-

obtinuerint, as if there could be no nullity in the matter but the want of ordination. It cannot be necessary to repeat what has been already said in refutation of this error.

We have, moreover, the most satisfactory evidence that the orders in question were uniformly condemned as invalid in Mary's reign. An unsuspicious contemporary writer says: "Ministers revolting to popery must, with their religion, have new orders."* In the commission issued by Cardinal Pole for the trial of Latimer and Ridley, they are styled "pretenced bishops." Many of the bishops "of King Edward's making," were deprived, "on account of the nullity of their consecration,"† and if others of them were deprived on other grounds; this only proves that there was a choice of motives for their removal. In the civil courts, the leases made by Ridley, bishop of London, in Edward's reign, were disallowed, because of the want of consecration in the lessor.‡ In the high court of Parliament, an authority beyond which an Anglican cannot consistently go,—Heylin tells us that "all consecrations were declared void and null which had been made according to the ordinal of King Edward the Sixth."§

Were it not that drowning men catch at straws, the advocates of Anglican ordinations would disregard the advantage which might accrue to their cause from the offer said to have been made by Pius V. to Queen Elizabeth, to approve the common prayer book and ordinal on certain conditions. Lord Coke in 1606, is said to have declared that he had seen the letter of the Pope, in which this promise was made; but, not to speak of the extreme

sonas alias ritè transferri contigerit, cathedralibus etiam metropolitanis ecclesiis in episcopos vel archiepiscopos præesse, ipsasque ecclesias in spiritualibus et temporalibus regere et gubernare, et munere consecrationis, eis impenso uti, VEL SI ILLUD EIS NONDAM IMPENSUM FUERIT, ab episcopis et archiepiscopis Catholicis per te nominandis suscipere libere et licite possint.—Bulla. Julii III., 8 Martii, 1554; (Wilkins, iv., 91;) Dodd, II., App. cxviii.

* Fox; Actes, p. 2, fol. 1464; apud Le Quien, T. II., p. 48.

† "Taylor, of Lincoln, in 1553, (consecrated by the new Ordinal, June 6, 1552,) was displaced from his see on the ground of the nullity of his consecration.—(Collier, Ch. Hist., Vol. II., p. 365.") Haddan; apud Evans, p. 235.

‡ Dicitur que les evêques in tempore Ed. 6, ne furent sacrés, et ideo ne fueront evêques, et ideo leases par uns par tiels, et conferinde par le Dean et Chapitre, ne liera le successeur car tiels ne unques fueront evêques. Contra des evêques deprivé, qui fuit evêques in fait tempore dimissionis et confirmation fait, viz. par le Dean et Chapitre."—Novelles cases. In the margin, Brooke wrote: "Leas par evêques nient sacrés, et par evêques déprivés, diversitie. Diference des baux passés par des evêques non sacres et par des evêques sacres."—Apud Le Quien, T. II., p. 52.

§ Apud Le Quien, T. II., p. 44.

improbability of the story, it is related by Camden as a rumor—*fama obtinet*,—and by him, referred to the first year of Pius IV. (1560.) This historian makes no mention of a letter, but says that Parpaglia, whom the Pope had privately sent to Elizabeth, made the offer on the part of the pontiff. The story is evidently false, and it is clear that Camden disbelieved it.*

Mr. Haddan adduces the case of "Dr. Carrier, on whose application to the Pope, in 1613, an offer of reconciliation was allowed to be made not involving re-ordination." Can he seriously believe that any one will credit such a statement? When to the defects of the ordinal were added the doubts, to use the most qualified term, which involved the fact of the consecration of the first bishops of Elizabeth's reign, can we believe that orders, which had been rejected in the time of Mary, when there was no question of this additional difficulty, would have been allowed by Rome; and this at a time when, as will hereafter be shown, the Nag's Head relation was generally believed? He also instances "the case of Dr. Gough, whose (English) orders were acknowledged by the Sorbonne, although denied by the Pope," of which consequently, no notice need be taken, were the fact as stated, which there is sufficient reason to deny.† But then, have not Catholic theologians, Cudsemius, Bossuet, Sancta Clara and Walsh, says Mr. Haddan, admitted the validity of the disputed orders?

The authority of Bossuet, the only respectable name among those mentioned, is boastingly brought forward, as if he admitted the validity of English orders. The passage relied upon in support of this assertion, is the following, which occurs in a letter written by him to Father Mabillon, and dated 12th August, 1685.

* Quæ Parpaglia proposuit non comperi, nec enim *scriptis mandata* credo; comminisci vero cum vulgo historicorum minime lubet. Fama obtinet Pontificem fidem dedisse Liturgiam Anglicam sua authoritate confirmaturum—dummodo illa Ecclesiæ Romanæ se aggregaret, Romanæque Cathedræ primatum agnosceret.—Annal. Eliz. pars 1, p. 59.

† M. Renaudot, whose treatise on the Anglican ordinations gave occasion to Courayer to appear in this controversy, was the intimate friend of Gough, who had received orders in the Catholic Church, and from him learned many things which he inserted in the work referred to. Is it not astonishing that he should not have alluded to this alleged opinion of the Sorbonne in favour of the English orders? Sir Thomas Vane, an Anglican clergyman, who, like Gough, became a Catholic, published the "Motives" of his conversion, in 1645, in which he says: "It is a very remarkable thing that the English bishops and ministers, in order to claim a legitimate succession, maintain that they have been consecrated by Catholic bishops; *which, as they cannot prove*, the interruption (i. e., want of succession,) is visible." —P. 206; apud Le Quien, T. II., p. 316.

"As to the affairs of England, beside the difficulty in relation to the first bishops, the authors of the schism; there is yet another in the time of Cromwell, when it is pretended that the succession of the ordination was interrupted. The English deny it; and as to the succession in the beginning of the schism, they maintain that there is no difficulty, and it appears that they have reason on their side. It depends upon fact, and the Holy See will not fail to act in this matter according to its ordinary circumspection."*

It is evident that Bossuet had not applied himself to the examination of the question to which he alludes, and all impartial men will acknowledge that nothing can be more unfair, than to bring forward a casual observation as an authority in so intricate a controversy. If Bossuet's name may be cited for the English orders, it cannot be unfair to use it against them. Le Grand, the author of the *Histoire du Divorce*, authorized Le Quien to mention the reply which this illustrious bishop made to him, when asked whether, in his reply to Burnet, he should give him the title of 'Bishop of Salisbury.' Bossuet told him to do no such thing, "because," added he, "we do not recognize that episcopate."

Cudsem and Walsh were apostate Franciscan friars whose misdeeds in the Church were rewarded by excommunication. Mr. Gould testified to Le Quien, in a letter dated 10th August, 1707, that, twelve years before that time, he was present in Cork, Ireland, when Walsh was publicly excommunicated, by bell, book, and candle. Of Santa Clara I can only say for the present that his advocacy of Anglican orders—if he did advocate them, for I have no means of consulting his works—is a strong presumption against him. It cannot be sufficiently regretted, that, in a question of such importance, men will eagerly profit by any authority, however slight, which may appear to encourage confidence in orders that are open to such multiplied objections; and that, while the names of a few, obscure, and, as in the case of Cudsemius and Walsh, unworthy men are boastingly paraded in support of claims of so momentous a character as those involved in the present question, the unanimous consent of Catholic theologians, the solemn decisions of a recognized tribunal of the Church, and the uniform practice of the Church itself should be set at nought.

* Apud Courayer, p. 320.

CHAPTER VII.

NAG'S HEAD CONSECRATION.

Among the "slanders and odious calumnies" which Mason endeavoured to refute, in 1613, is the narrative of an event which is generally known by the name of the Nag's head consecration, from the sign of a tavern in Cheapside, London, where it is said to have taken place. By the defenders of Anglican orders it is indignantly rejected as an absurd and malicious invention of Roman Catholic writers, who are in mass condemned as men unprincipled enough to concoct and maintain any story that might annoy their adversaries. By most of those who have impugned the validity of Anglican orders, it has been received, for at least two centuries, as a real occurrence, attested by stubborn evidence: although by some as not necessary for the maintenance of their cause, it has been passed over in silence; while it has been rejected by a few modern writers, who, although not engaged in controversy on the subject, have had occasion to refer to it. Among these last mentioned are the Rev. Dr. Lingard and the recent editor of Dodd, the Rev. M. Tierney.

In reviewing the evidence adduced in support and confutation of this extraordinary relation, I have a twofold object: 1stly, to shew that it is not so destitute of foundation as to justify the reproaches which Protestant writers take occasion to make against the Catholic divines who related and believed it; and secondly, to withhold nothing from the reader which may throw light on the question which forms the subject of this work. I shall give the narration, as found in the work of Dr. Champney, published in English in 1616, and in Latin in 1618. Next I shall endeavour to shew that there is no intrinsic improbability in the recital; and, finally, shall pass in review the evidence which has been offered to sustain or disprove this fact, or fable, as the reader may choose to call it.

"At the Nag's-head, in Cheapside, by accorded appointment, met all those who were nominated to bishoprics; thither came also the old bishop of Landaff, to make them bishops; which being

known to Dr. Bonner, bishop of London, then prisoner, he sent unto the bishop of Landaff, forbidding him, under pain of excommunication, to exercise any such power within his diocese, as to ordain these men. Wherewith the old bishop being terrified, and besides also moved in his own conscience, refused to proceed in that action; alleging, chiefly, for reason of his forbearance, his want of sight: which excuse they interpreting to be an evasion, they were much moved against the poor old man. And whereas, hitherto, they had used him with all courtesy and respect, they then changed their copy; reviling him and calling him 'doating fool,' and the like: some of them saying, 'This old fool thinketh we cannot be bishops, unless we be greased,'*—to the disgrace as well of him, as of the Catholic manner of episcopal consecration. Being, notwithstanding, thus deceived in their expectation, and having no other means to come to their desire, they resolve to use Master Scory's help, who, having borrowed the name of bishop in King Edward's time, was thought to have sufficient power to perform that office, especially in such strait necessity. He having cast off, together with his religious habit, all scruple of conscience, did the thing quickly, which he performed in this sort.—Having the Bible in his hand, they all kneeling before him, he laid it upon every one of their heads or shoulders, saying, '*Take thou authority to preach the word of God sincerely*,' and so they rose up bishops. This whole narration, without adding or detracting any word pertaining to the substance of the matter, I have heard oftener than once, of Master Thomas Bluett, a grave, learned and judicious priest; he having received it of Master Neal, a man of good sort and reputation, sometime reader of the Hebrew Lecture in Oxford; but when this matter passed, was belonging to Bishop Bonner, and sent by him to deliver the message before mentioned to the bishop of Landaff, and withal to attend there to see the end of the business. Again Mr. Bluett had other good means to be informed of this matter, being a long time prisoner with Dr. Watson, bishop of Lincoln, and other men of note of the ancient clergy, in whose time, and in whose sight, one may say the matter was done. This was related to me by Master Bluett in Wisbech castle." In the Paris edition of 1618, this last circumstance is thus mentioned.

* This phrase was not unusual among the so-called English Reformers. See the passage already quoted from Dr. Fulke, p. 71. Calvin used a similar expression, and that in his great work, the "Institutions."

"And of this narration, there are now as many witnesses as there are priests living, who were captives for the faith in the aforesaid castle of Wisbech, with the aforesaid Master Bluet, in which place I also had it from him."*

Against the narrative two objections of a general character are urged, which it will be necessary to consider, before we examine the authority on which it rests. First, it is said, that the tale is so absurd as to be incredible; and, secondly, that there is no vestige of it to be found in any writer of the time of Queen Elizabeth, when we should naturally expect to find it most explicitly put forth.

The alleged absurdity of the tale is derived from the impossibility of conceiving how men, such as the first bishops of Elizabeth's reign, could so far forget what was due to their character and position, as to take part in such sacrilegious buffoonery, and select such an inappropriate place for a sacred ceremony as a tavern. Nor is it more easy to reconcile the narrative with the well ascertained desire of Elizabeth, that her bishops should as much as possible appear before the people as invested with a sacred character.

It must be always borne in mind that the manners of modern times are not those of the sixteenth century; and that, however unsuitable a tavern might be deemed on this side of the Atlantic for an ordinary meeting of clergymen, the London Crown and Anchor tavern has, even in our own times, been selected as the meeting place for some of the most respectable associations. That a meeting was held at the Nag's head tavern, on occasion of Parker's confirmation, is admitted by all who have examined the subject; and that this meeting was the cause of the rumor that the new bishops were ordained there is expressly stated by Fuller and Heylin, both Protestant writers. When Fuller wrote his Church History, the Nag's head tavern was yet to be seen in Cheapside; and, at the entrance to it, he tells us, was a mock pulpit, or something having the appearance of one.† This last circumstance suggests a conjecture, which, probably, may have some weight, and may serve to explain how it was, that a tavern came to be chosen as the place of ordination. The Nag's head‡ was an eccle-

* Champney, p. 499. † Fuller, Book IX., p. 61.

‡ "The inn chiefly frequented by the clergy at that time."—Lingard, Vol. VII., p. 380. London, 1844.

siastical hotel or inn, such as are to be found in all the large cities of Europe, where prelates and other ecclesiastics from the country —not having residences in the town—put up. With it may have been connected a domestic chapel—as is the case, I have been told, in some such hotels in Europe, even at the present day—for the convenience of those who made the tavern their temporary residence; and this chapel may have been chosen as a suitable place for prevailing on Landaff to do an act, so irregular as the consecration of notorious heretics, and that, in the diocese of another bishop.*

The circumstances in which this event is said to have occurred must be remembered. In the course of less than thirty years, the English nation had passed through four different changes of religion,—under Henry, Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. Of all the bishops whom this last mentioned princess found on ascending the throne, one only proved faithless, and he only did as much as might enable him to keep his see. Of the inferior clergy, we may form an equally favourable judgment: for although many of them retained their livings, at the sacrifice of their convictions, the defection was by no means so general, as it had been in the reign of Henry VIII. On this subject, the testimony of Dr. Heylin is unexceptionable. "Partly by the deprivation of these few persons (fourteen Bishops, six Abbots, Priors, and Governors of Religious Orders, twelve Deans and as many Archdeacons, fifteen Presidents or Masters of colleges, fifty prebendaries of cathedral churches, and about eighty persons or vicars,)—but principally by the death of so many in the last year's sickness, there was not a sufficient number of men to supply the cures, which filled the Church with an ignorant and illiterate clergy, whose learning went no farther than the Liturgy, or the book of Homilies, but otherwise conformable (which was no small felicity) to the rules of the Church. And on the other side, many were raised to great preferments,—who having spent their time of exile in such foreign churches as followed the platform of Geneva, returned so dissaffected to Episcopal Government, unto the rites and ceremonies here by law estab-

* Mr. Waterworth remarks, (p. 338, note,) that Lambeth was out of the Bishop of London's jurisdiction; and intimates the fact as furnishing an objection to the account of Bonner, threatening Kitchin with excommunication. It was not at Lambeth, but in Cheapside, within Bonner's jurisdiction, that the threat of excommunication is said to have been made. Consequently, the observation regarding Lambeth has no application to the fact as related.

liseed, as not long after filled the Church with most sad disorders."* When all things were in this state of confusion; when worthless and degraded characters were intruded into the pulpit, which the learned and orthodox clergy of the English Church were no longer permitted to occupy; can we be surprised at the 'hole and corner' character of a consecration which three Catholic bishops absolutely refused to perform: and which Kitchin might well be ashamed to perform in public,—the bishop elect being notorious for his heterodox tenets?

Is it certain that no vestige of this story is found in any writer of the age of Elizabeth? There is not, indeed, any detailed account of the transaction extant, earlier than that of Holliwood (Sacrobosco) who wrote in 1603, but we have most conclusive evidence that the alleged fact was related and extensively believed before the appearance of his work.† Not to speak now of the direct evidence adduced to substantiate its truth, the following admissions of Protestant writers, who have rejected the relation, show that some, and these very distinct, vestiges of it may be discovered to have existed in the time of Elizabeth.

Fuller published his Church history in 1655; in it he denies that Parker was consecrated at the Nag's head, but shews, that, whatever may have been the nature of the meeting held there, it is most unjust to regard the story, as pure fiction, inspired by hatred of Protestantism. His words are:—"Now though we are not to gratifie our adversaries with any advantage against us, yet so confident is our innocence herein, that I may acquaint the world with the small *foundation*, on which the whole *report* was *bottomed*. Every archbishop or bishop presents himself in *Bow Church*, accompanied thither with *civilians*, where any shall be heard who can make any legall exceptions, against his election. A dinner was provided for them at the Nag's-head in Cheapside, as convenient for the vicinity thereof, and from this *sparke*, hath all this fire been kindled; to admonish posterity not only to do no evil, but also, in this captious age, to refrain from *all appearance* thereof."

* Heylin, p. 115, 1559.

† The Nag's-head narrative was mentioned by Holliwood, (Sacrobosco,) in his work, "De investiganda Ecclesia," published at Rheims, in 1603; by Dr. Kellison, in his *Reply to Sutcliffe*, published in 1608; and also in his *Examen Novæ Reformationis*, published in 1616; by Fitzimmons, in his *Britannomachus*, Douay, 1614; By Fitzherbert, in the Supplement to the Discussion of Barlow's Answer, 1613; as also in *Adjoinder*, published the same year, and in his preface to *Discussion*.—See Tierney, Dodd, Vol. II., p. cclxxiv.

In the margin, he says:—"This the Lord Chancellor Egerton affirmed to Bishop Williams."* Dr. Heylin repeats the same thing, almost in the same language:—"But to proceed," says he, "unto the consecration of the new Archbishop; the first thing to be done after the passing of the royal assent for ratifying of the election of the dean and chapter, was the confirming of it in the court of Arches, according to the usual form in that behalf: which being accordingly performed, the Vicar General, the dean of the Arches, the proctors and officers of the court, whose presence was required at this solemnity, were entertained at a dinner provided for them at the Nag's-head in Cheapside; for which though Parker paid the shot, yet shall the Church be called to an after-reckoning." He then gives a minute account of the supposed consecration of the 17th of December, after which he says, that after the ceremony "there was a plentiful dinner for the entertainment of the company which resorted thither. Amongst whom Charles Howard (eldest son of William Lord Effingham, created afterwards Lord Admiral, and Earl of Nottingham,) happened to be one, and after testified to the truth of all these particulars, when the reality and form of this consecration was called in question by some captious sticklers for the Church of Rome.

"For so it was, that some sticklers for the Church of Rome, having been told of the dinner which was made at the Nag's head tavern, at such times as the election of the new archbishop was confirmed in the Arches, raised a report that the Nag's head tavern was the place of consecration. And this report was countenanced by another slander, causing it to be noised abroad, and published in some seditious pamphlets, that the persons designed by the queen, for several bishoprics, being met at a tavern, did then and there lay hands on one another without form or order."†

We may here remark the important fact, which this last extract

* Fuller, Book IX.

† History of Queen Elizabeth, pp. 121, 122.—"The same explanation of the origin of the story is given by Strype, in his life of Parker, (57,) and by Collier, (II., 461,) and is fully adopted by Le Courayer, in his Defence of the English Ordinations.—Williams's Translation, p. 35. Yet Mr. Hallam can sully his pages with such a note as the following: 'Even Dr. Lingard admits that Parker was consecrated at Lambeth, on Dec. 17, 1559; but *conjectures* that there *may* have been some previous meeting at the Nag's head, which gave rise to the story. This means that any absurdity may be presumed, rather than acknowledge good Catholics to have propagated a lie.'"—Hallam's Constitutional History, 1, 159; Tierney, note in Dodd, Vol. II.

from Heylin lets out; namely, that the Nag's head consecration, instead of being first published fifty years after the event, as Protestant writers maintain, was noised abroad and published in some seditious pamphlets soon after the fact occurred. If it was not thought of until fifty years afterwards, how could Parker's dinner at Cheapside have been, as it confessedly was, the "small foundation of the story?"

Dr. Heylin, indeed, says, "that the silence of all Popish writers concerning this Nag's head consecration, during the whole reign of Queen Elizabeth, when it had been most material for them to have insisted upon it, as much discredited the whole figment, as the author of it." Mr. Evans, in adducing this passage, opposes it to my inference from the facts mentioned by Heylin, and gives his readers to understand, that I had *cited* Heylin as saying, that the fact was noised abroad and published in some seditious pamphlets soon after it is said to have occurred. This Heylin does not say: he says, indeed, the contrary; and I never quoted him as saying what was but my own inference from his words. The words "lets out," contain an allusion that no ordinary reader should have mistaken; not to advert to the argument I used to show, that, *if* the Nag's head dinner gave rise to the rumour of the Nag's head consecration, this latter must have gone abroad soon after the time of the dinner. It is very difficult to imagine that such an event, especially as it is supposed to have been an ordinary occurrence, whenever a bishop was confirmed in the Court of Arches, could, after a lapse of half a century, have had any influence in originating the relation of the Nag's head consecration. This inference I still regard as perfectly legitimate.

But, it may be asked, why did not the Catholic writers of Elizabeth's time make mention of it, or, at least, allude to it in more distinct terms?—We must remember what was the condition of the Catholics during that reign. Far from having the liberty of publishing, they were obliged to avoid, at the peril of their lives and fortunes, even the external worship of their religion. Hence, those Catholic writers, and they were many, who denied the consecration of the English bishops, were forced to publish their works on the continent of Europe, principally in the Low Countries; and every conceivable impediment was opposed to their introduction into England during the reign of Elizabeth.* The

* See the Queen's letter to the Bishop of London, in 1564, for seizing books,

supposed silence of Catholic writers, is, consequently, no argument against the Nag's head consecration narrative.

But they were not silent. I have shown, in the third chapter of this book, that, from the year 1563 up to the time of the publication of Mason's book, the Protestant bishops were reproached with not having received *consecration;* and although this, of itself, does not prove the Nag's head story, it is conclusive against the supposed consecration at Lambeth; and is, as will be presently seen, intimately connected with the mock consecration at Cheapside. Mason's work professes, in the title-page, to clear the English bishops and clergy "from the slanders and odious imputations of Bellarmine, Sanders, Bristow, Harding, Allen, Stapleton, Parsons, Kellison, Eudemon, Becanus, and other Romanists." What these "slanders and odious imputations" were, we learn from the work of Mason, who, far from decrying the Nag's head consecration as a recent fiction, supplies the most positive evidence of the contrary. He shows very clearly that before his writing, the fact was very generally believed. "This of the Nagges head," says he, "thought it goe currant at Rome, and be blazed for a trueth, through the world by men of your rancke,"—He elsewhere alludes to it in a passage already given by me, (p. 115,) as a "tradition."

It is evident from the words of Heylin, already quoted, that the matter was noised abroad, and published in seditious pamphlets, shortly after the event. And, indeed, how otherwise could an ordinary dinner-party, after the lapse of fifty years, be supposed to have given rise to so improbable a rumour? According to Fuller, "Sanders, (who died in 1583,) lewdly lies that these new elected bishops, out of good fellowship, mutually consecrated each other." The same was also affirmed of Sanders by Dr. Kellison, as we learn from Mason, who, however, says that Sanders mentions no such thing. It may not, perhaps, be found in his "History of the English Schism," which, of all his works, is the one

which were published abroad, and brought into England. This was specially directed against Harding, who was engaged, about this time, in the controversy with Jewel.—Cardwell's Documentary Annals, Vol. I., p. 297. "Now were many of the English Popish recusants become fugitives abroad, in Flanders, and particularly in Antwerp and Louvain, and in other places in the King of Spain's dominions. Here they employed themselves in writing very dangerous and seditious books against the queen and her government, which, when they had printed, they caused to be conveyed over hither, and privily dispersed abroad, which had perverted many of the ignorant people."—Strype, Ann., Vol. I., p. 2, pp. 182, 529.

most generally known: but these testimonies render it probable that he mentioned it in some other of his numerous works. The denial of Mason, is, consequently, inconclusive; and he himself supplies a clear proof that something like the Nag's head story gave rise to the act of 8 Eliz., before inserted. Describing Parker's consecration at Lambeth, he says: "And it pleased the Almighty so to dispose that all things were performed in most exquisite manner, *yet the Papists, such was their hatred against the clergie, did blaze abroad the contrarie:* whereupon the High Court of Parliament assembled in the eighth year of that famous queen, having deeply considered and pondered all things, pronounced that their speeches were *slanderous*, not grounded on any just cause."*

Mr. Evans is dissatisfied with this reply: he says, that, if at all to be found in the writings of Sanders it ought to occur in his History of the English Schism; and that, if it existed there, or in any other of his works, it would have been produced long since. Perhaps so; but this does not show that Kellison was mistaken. He may have had some work of Sanders,† some ephemeral pamphlet which has not come down to us, and in which the fact may have been mentioned. Were Mason's denial a sufficient motive for denying that Sanders wrote thus, it is very strange that Fuller, who followed Mason on the same side, should have admitted the name of Sanders into his pages in connexion with this relation; by whom also Parsons is enumerated among the propagators of this "odious calumny." Fuller, or Kellison, on whom Fuller is said to have relied in this instance, had much better opportunities of knowing what Sanders and Parsons wrote and said, than those who live now can have, of what they did not write or say. This observation is also applicable to Harding, the first English Catholic divine who reproached the new prelates with their unepiscopal character. The words of Fuller, show that long before Kellison and Holliwood (Sacrobosco), the Nag's head narrative was publicly declared by Parsons and Constable. "But when one Jesuite had got this shameless lie of the Nag's head (I cannot say by the tail, but) by the ears, instantly Champney, Fitzsimmons, Parsons,

* Mason, p. 133.

† Sanders dedicated a work, entitled "The Rock of the Church," in 1567, to "the Right Worshipful Mathew Parker, bearing the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury."—Louvain, 1569, quoted by Mason.

Kellison, and Constable, and all the whole kennel of them, baule it out in their books to all posterity."* The only refutation, or rather attempt at refutation, that I have been able to discover in Mason or Fuller,—and I ought to remark that this latter says that "Mason left no stone unturned to clear the truth,"—is, 1, that some Pope John is said to have ordained a deacon in a stable—2, that the fable of Pope Joan, although a fable, was yet for a time believed—3, that the Nag's head narrative is so absurd as to be incredible—4, that Parker was consecrated at Lambeth; which is the very thing called in question, and the first *public* announcement of which, in 1613, by Mason, caused universal astonishment in those Catholic writers, who had made the English ordinations the subject of a patient and conscientious examination.

We have the following evidence that Harding, Fitzsimmons, and others, publicly avowed their belief of the fact. In the year 1616, Bishop Godwin published his book, '*De Præsulibus Angliæ Commentarius*,' (Commentary on the bishops of England.) In this he mentions the consecration of Parker on the 17th of December, 1559, precisely as Mason in 1613. After which he says:—"If you enquire about the place of this consecration, this was no other than the usual place, namely, the chapel of the archiepiscopal palace of Lambeth, *however such scapegraces as Harding, Fitzsimmons, and others may say otherwise.* Although Harding may possibly be excused, as he delivered (published) WHAT NO ONE HAD YET DENIED, although he himself never believed it. For what man of sound mind would put any faith in so absurd and improbable a calumny?"†

Referring to the act of Parliament of 8th Elizabeth, (see p. 47,) Camden, in his annals of her reign, says: "For the papists decried them (the bishops) as no bishops, probably because the unction, the ring, the crozier, and the blessings were omitted (in their consecration;) and as if they had not been properly consecrated by three bishops who could trace back their ordination to the apostolical authority received from Christ."‡ He then proceeds to state

* Fuller, lib. 9, p. 61.

† De loco, si quæras, hujus consecrationis haud alius fuit quam consuetus, capella nimirum palatii archiepiscopalis Lamethensis utcumque diversa tradant impudentissimi rabulæ, Hardingus, Fitzsimons, alii.—Quanquam Hardingo aliquo fortassis modo ignosci possit, quod, QUÆ NEMO ADHUC ARGUERIT, tradiderit, sibi tametsi nunquam credita. Quis enim sanæ mentis tam ridiculæ et ab omni probabilitate abhorrenti calumniæ fidem adhibuerit?—Godwin, p. 219. London ed., 1616.

‡ Pontificii enim illis tanquam pseudo episcopis obtrectarunt, forsan eo quod unc-

that, as appears by the registers, all had been done, as Mason says, 'in the most exquisite manner.' But if all had been done so orderly, how account for the 'slanderous speech,' commemorated in the preamble of the act of Parliament in question?

"It is now a century of years," says the author of 'The Nullity of the Prelatic clergy of England,' "since the Nag's head story happened. It has *constantly* been related and credited by wise men, as a certain truth ever since the year 1559, (the year it was acted in): it was never contradicted by any, until it was imagined by our adversaries that the new registers (Mason's) might contest with our ancient tradition, and make the Nag's head story seem improbable in the year 1613, of which no man doubted for the space of fifty-two years before. The Catholic bishops and doctors of Queen Mary's time were sober and wise men; they believed the story; and recounted it to Parsons, Fitzherbert, Dr. Kellison, Holliwood, Dr. Champney, Fitzsimmons, etc. Parsons believed it. Fitzherbert, and the rest above named, gave so much credit to it, that they published it in print."*

It cannot, surely, be said by any one who considers the import of the foregoing extracts from Mason, Godwin, Fuller, and Heylin,—to say nothing of the writer last quoted, that there is no vestige of the Nag's head story to be found during the reign of Queen Elizabeth.

These observations show, that however extraordinary the fact which forms the subject of this chapter, and however unwillingly the judgment may assent to the probability of its having occurred, it is not,—whether considered in itself, or in the circumstances wherein it is said to have taken place,—so intrinsically improbable as to preclude all necessity for examining the evidence brought forward to prove it. This evidence is principally, but not entirely, derived from the testimony of Neal, who is said to have been sent by Bishop Bonner, and was, it is stated, an eye witness of the transaction. The character of Neal is thus given by Wood, a protestant historian.

tio, annulus, pedum pastorale, cum benedictionibus non adhibita, et quasi à tribus episcopis non essent rite ordinati, qui suam ascendendo ordinationem ad apostolicam authoritatem a Christo acceptam referre possent.—Camden's Annales, p. 103.

* The author of this book was Peter Talbot, born in 1620, who, in 1669, was made Archbishop of Dublin. He died in prison, being one of the victims of Oates' plot, in 1680. He was brother of Richard Talbot, Duke of Tyrconnel.

"Thomas Neale was born at Yeate in Gloucestershire, entered when a child into the college near Winchester, by the endeavours of his mother's brother, Alexander Belsire, Fellow of New College, where profiting exceedingly in grammar learning in the school there, was chosen probationer of New College in 1538, and two years after was admitted true and perpetual fellow of the same house. Afterwards prosecuting his studies with great industry, took the degree of Master of Arts; in 1546, holy orders, and soon after became an able theologist, and admirably well skilled in the Greek and Hebrew languages; the last of which he read to several young scholars in the University, particularly to Bernard Gilpin of Queen's College.—About that time Sir Thomas Whyte, who was afterwards founder of St. John's College, having had notice of his pregnant parts and virtues, did for an encouragement allow him a yearly pension of £10. In the beginning of Queen Mary, he became chaplain to Dr. Bonner, Bishop of London, and in 1556 being newly returned from Paris, and other places in France, he was admitted to the reading of the sentences, being then rector of Thenforth in Northamptonshire. But when Queen Elizabeth came to the crown, and thereupon bereft of his lord and patron, Bonner, he betook himself to Oxon (Oxford), and in 1559, he was made the queen's professor of the Hebrew lecture, entered himself a commoner of Hart-hall, and built little lodgings opposite thereunto, joining to the west end of New College Cloister, wherein he lived several years; but his religion being more catholic than protestant, he left Oxon as he had done his lecture before, and being of a timorous nature, and always dreading his being called into question for his seldom frequenting the church and receiving the sacrament, he retired to an obscure village called Cassington,—where purchasiug a house, he spent the remainder of his days in study and devotion. As he was accounted by many an eminent theologian and linguist, so by some a tolerable philosopher, poet, and geographer; (here follows an account of his writings.) What else he hath performed either in writing or translating, I cannot tell, neither any thing material of him besides only, (1) that he is noted by some writers, to be the original reporter of the consecration of Mathew Parker to the see of Canterbury, at the Nag's head tavern in Cheapside, which since is manifestly made a mere forgery, and (2) that in the year 1590 he

being then seventy-one years of age, did put up a monument for himself."*

The testimony of Neal has been transmitted to us through several distinct channels—through Holliwood, Champney, Kellison, Pitzæus, Fitzsimmons, Constable.

Anthony Champney was among the priests who were confined in Wisbeach Castle, England, during the latter part of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In the year 1601 he was permitted, in company with three other priests, to proceed to Rome, on a mission connected with the differences which, then, unhappily prevailed among the few and persecuted clergy of England; occasioned, principally, by the preference which some gave to what was then called the Spanish succession to the throne. Champney was among those opposed to this party, and in favour of that to which the Queen inclined; and it was not without the privity of her council, that he and his companions obtained their liberty, and were permitted to leave the kingdom. He subsequently became a member of an association of learned and zealous English clergymen, who united their efforts for the amelioration of the condition of their fellow Catholics and countrymen. He was made Doctor of the Sorbonne University in Paris, in which city he composed and published his book on the subject of the present controversy. He states, that he heard the account of the Nag's head consecration, which I have copied from his book, from a fellow prisoner in Wisbeach Castle, Mr. Thomas Bluett, who gave Neal as his authority, and of this assertion of Bluett, Champney cites as many witnesses as were then survivors of the priests confined on that occasion.

The learned Jesuit, Holliwood, called from the Italian of his name, Sacrobosco, asserts, that he heard it also from a holy priest, named Thomas Haberley, to whom Neal had communicated the fact. This he published in 1603, in the preface to a book called 'A Discussion.' Writing against Bishop Jewell, he says: "Of Mr. Jewell's being a bishop we have not so much certainty: yea, we have no certainty at all: for, who, I pray you, made him? Who gave him his jurisdiction? Who imposed hands on him? What orders had they? What bishops were they? It is true that both he, Sands, Scorey, Horn, Grindall, and others, in the

* Wood's Athenæ Oxonienses, Vol. 1, p. 249. London, 1721.

beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, met at the Nag's head in Cheapside, (a fit sign for such a sacrament) and being disappointed of the Catholic bishop of Landaff, who should have been there to consecrate them, they dealt with Scorey of Hertford, to do so; who, when they were all on their knees, caused John Jewell to rise up bishop of Salisbury, and him that was Robert Horn before, to rise up bishop of Winchester, and so forth with all the rest." This account Mason has inserted in his appendix to his Defence of the English Ordinations; and the only reply he attempts to make to it, is, that "no one of common sense could persuade himself that they (the newly elected) had agreed to meet in a tavern, to be consecrated in it, and thus incur the penalty of the law, since they had already an Archbishop, such as they desired, a professor of their religion, and a quiet possessor of his Church and See."

Mr. Bluett, to whom, among others, Neal communicated the circumstance, was a prisoner in the Marshalsea, London, in 1579, at which time he was forty years old, as may be seen in Fox's list of prisoners on account of religion, copied from Strype, in Dodd. He was subsequently among the confessors of the faith confined in Wisbeach Castle, where his name appears first among the signatures of thirty-three clergymen there imprisoned for their religion, among whom was Champney, to an appeal against the archpriest Blackwell, on the 17th of November, 1600. He suffered an imprisonment of twenty-two years for his religion.* On one occasion he was heard before the Privy Council, and was admitted to an audience with the Queen in 1601.†

Pitzæus, who published his work *De illustribus Angliæ Scriptoribus*, in 1618, at Paris, states that Neal is said to have been sent by Bonner to the Nag's head, to excommunicate Landaff, should he proceed to consecrate the new bishops.‡ This, along

* Dodd, III., p. 49, note by Tierney. † Ib. p. 54.

‡ Erat (Neal) vir in fide catholica semper educatus, et in ea solide fundatus. Unde in omnibus quæ suo tempore contigerunt in Anglia circa religionem mutationibus immutabilis semper perstitit, et nihil unquam sua vocatione alienum, nihil viro pio, gravi, et docto indignum commisit, licet alioquin esset naturæ mirum in modum timidæ.—Hic ille ipse est qui a Revdmo D. D. Episcopo Londinensi, Bonnero missus esse dicitur initio regni Elizabethæ ad episcopum Landavensem, ne novellis quibusdam ministris (qui episcopi fieri cuperent, nec tamen catholici esse vellent,) manus cito imponeret. Adfuitque quando ex illis unus quidam *non consecratus ipse* alios nova forma consecrare præsumpsit, Londini, in vico dicto *Cheapside* ad caput manuli.—Pitzæus, p. 770. Paris, 1618.

with other particulars regarding Neal, he appears to have learned from Henry Orton, a layman, who, in August, 1581, was examined along with twelve priests by authority of the government, concerning certain passages extracted from the works of Sanders, Bristow and Allen. In 1585 he was sent into exile, along with twenty-one priests who were "unexpectedly, by the Queen's order, put on board a vessel, and landed against their wills on the coast of Normandy."*

Dr. Kellison was a disciple of Cardinal Allen. He received the degree of doctor in 1598,† and was the fourth President of Douay College.‡ He states, "that as none of the Catholic Prelates would ordain Queen Elizabeth's new bishops, they were obliged to wait upon an Irish Archbishop, then prisoner in the tower, and with many entreaties and offers of great rewards, to desire him to lay hands on them; which bishop refusing, they were forced to request Scory's assistance, which otherwise they had not desired, because they knew him only to be titular bishop, and unlawfully made in King Edward's time. So Constable relates it from Stow, who, though he durst not put it into his chronicle, yet used often to tell it to the Catholics of whom some are yet alive. Many others worthy of all credit have related the same; and one Thomas Neale, Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, who also himself was an eye witness, used to declare to many persons (whereof some are yet living) that the consecration of the first mock bishops, under Queen Elizabeth, was in a tavern in London, at the Nag's head in Cheapside; a fit church for such a consecration. So also Sacro Bosco (Holliwood) relates it, and because they were sensible that they were not consecrated according to the Statute, 25th Henry VIII., which requires that a bishop be not consecrated but by three bishops, with the consent of the Metropolitan; and besides that a rumor was set abroad that they were not rightly ordained bishops, they were forced to call for the assistance of the secular arm, that they might in a following parliament be confirmed by the lay power."§

The author of the "Nullity of the Protestant Clergy of England," says in the postscript to that work: "Since the finishing of the point, I have had occasion to find out some particulars. Mr.

* Dodd, III., p. 158. † Tierney's Dodd, Vol. III., p. 54. ‡ Milner.
§ Kellison; Examen Novæ Reformationis, ed. 1616; quoted from Elrington, by Evans, pp. 129, 130.

Abbot (Archbishop) of Canterbury showed to F. Faircloth (one of the priests who, in King James the First's reign, were permitted to see the Lambeth register) certain records. But Mr. Plowden, yet living, does depose, that he had it from Father Faircloth's own mouth, with whom he lived many years an intimate friend, this ensuing answer of Father Faircloth to Abbot. My Lord, said he, my father was a protestant, and kept a shop in Cheapside, and assured me that he himself was present at Parker's, and the first protestant bishops' consecration at the Nag's head in Cheapside, &c. This supposed, my Lord, I cannot but judge this is a forged register."*

The author of a book, entitled, *A legacy left to Protestants*, printed at Douay, 1654, declares that he heard from Dr. Derbyshire, who was nephew of Bishop Bonner, and had been canon of St. Paul's and archdeacon of Exeter, as of his own knowledge, that the first Protestant prelates, like good fellows, had made themselves bishops at an inn, because they could not get true bishops to consecrate them.† The same author alleges the testimony of another gentleman of known worth and credit, who had it from his father, one of the Chief Justices of the realm, that being at dinner with Archbishop Heath, at Cobham, in Surrey, he saw a letter from Bishop Bonner in the Marshalsea, by one of his chaplains, to the Archbishop, wherein he merrily related the manner how these new bishops ordained one another, in an inn, where they were met together.‡

The author of the treatise on the *Nature of Catholic faith and heresy*, (printed in 1657,) Peter Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin, born in 1620, died in prison, 1680, says: (p. 9,) "I have spoken with both Catholics and protestants that remember near fourscore years, and acknowledge that so long they have heard the Nag's head story related as an undoubted truth."§

Thus we have several distinct relations of this event, through grave and trustworthy persons, who had no motive to cause them to give hasty credence to an idle tale, and who have left the strongest evidence of their attachment to truth, by adhering to a proscribed cause, and suffering the loss of station, preferment, and

* Grounds of the Old Religion, p. 146.

† Referring to some violent expression attributed to him, Strype says: "By the way, one might hence make an observation upon what a prejudiced person the chief evidence of the Nag's head ordination doth depend. For the popish writers do allege Mr. Derbishire with the greatest confidence."—Strype; Annals, II., p. 87.

‡ Ib. 146.

§ Ib. 149.

the deprivation of their liberty during many years. Whatever exceptions may be taken to their testimony, it cannot be rejected as that of men unworthy of credit. Besides these witnesses, we have the positive testimony of one every way worthy of credit, that Stow had examined into the Nag's head narrative; that he believed it; that he communicated it to others; and that he was prevented solely by fear from inserting it in his Chronicle. "Not only," says Champney, "the Catholics, who might appear to our adversaries of suspicious faith,—are witnesses of this solemn meeting at the Nag's head; but also John Stow, that most famous chronographer of England, a professor of the reformed religion, bore witness to it,—not, indeed, in his writings, for he dared not, but by his word, to some of his acquaintances, men of the most undoubted faith (integerrimae fidei), some of whom are yet living, and attest the same; who, however, are not to be named here, as they are no less afraid to testify that publicly of him who is now dead, than he was to write it when he lived.

"But concerning this thing I find the following in the manuscripts of that learned and noble man, Henry Constable, who, as all who knew him will acknowledge, was of a strong and sharp mind, and was not easily moved by light conjectures. 'Parker was ordained by at most two heretic priests, not bishops. If, indeed, Barlow assisted Scory in that action; which I indeed know not (quod me quidem latet). But that old man, the bishop of Landaff, who was brought to the place designed for the consecration of Parker and the rest, pretended to have lost the use of his eyes, lest he should commit so great a sacrilege;—whence it happened, that they recurred to Scory, of whom before they had not thought; which not only Catholics of most unquestionable integrity, who were eye-witnesses of the affair, testify, but also John Stow is witness of the same, who diligently inquired into all the circumstances of this action, although he feared to relate them in his Chronicle."*

Mr. Evans objects to these relations, that they are inconsistent with each other, although all professedly derived from the same source,—Neal. Fitzsimmons states, 1st, That the Bishop of

* Champnæus. De vocat. min. pp. 501, 502.—Dodd, referring to this testimony of Constable, speaks of his manuscript as already old when quoted by Champney, in 1615.—Vol. II., App. cclxxiv. Fitzsimmons, in 1614, in his Brittannomachia, p. 320; and Kellison, in his Examen Novæ Reformationis, Douay, in 1616, mention the relation of Constable regarding Stow's silence.

Landaff was not present on the occasion; and that the meeting at the tavern was resolved upon after a refusal on the part of an Irish archbishop, then confined in the Tower of London; and without any expectation of obtaining consecration from Landaff. 2d, Fitzsimmons makes no mention of placing the Bible on the head and shoulders of the new bishops; but says, that Scory took the new prelates, who were kneeling, by the hand, and told them to rise up Lord Bishop of, etc. 3d. Fitzsimmons says, that Neal came from Oxford to stop the consecration, whereas the other accounts represent him as having been sent by Bonner from the Tower of London. Mr. Evans adds, that about this time Neal was appointed by Queen Elizabeth, Professor of Hebrew at Oxford; that it is probable his relations with Bonner had previously ceased; and that he was not a person likely to be engaged in opposing the queen's wishes in the matter of the consecration?*

The reader must say whether these points of difference are irreconcilable with the substantial truth of the relations in which they are found. To me they do not present even the shadow of a contradiction. Whence Neal came to be present on the occasion, matters not: all agree that he was sent by Bonner. Mr. Evans would, very properly, laugh at any one who should object to the Lambeth consecration of Parker on such slight and unsubstantial grounds. He knows that nothing is more common than to find the same event narrated differently by different persons; and this, sometimes, when the narrators are eye-witnesses of the facts they mention; and that so far from these apparent discrepancies supplying a motive for rejecting their testimony, it not unfrequently is found to strengthen it. There is nothing to show that Neal was appointed to the Hebrew professorship at Oxford before the time assigned by the narrators of the Nag's head consecration, September, 1559. That he was named to that chair in 1559, is certain; and the natural timidity of his character, the unwillingness to expose himself to danger, and the wish to lead a tranquil, retired life, when his principles were not compromised, may have caused him to observe a prudent silence on the extraordinary fact of which he had been witness, and in which he acted so conspicuous a part.

To this account of the Nag's head consecration, many other objec-

* Essays on Anglican Ordination, p. 63.

tions have been made. Most of them are trivial; some only impeach the consistency of some Catholic writers who have maintained its truth; and only a few present any appearance of real difficulty. I shall briefly notice the objections which are usually urged by the advocates of Anglican orders against the narrative of this extraordinary event, and which have not been already touched upon.

It is not likely that Landaff, who had already incurred ecclesiastical censures, by taking the oath of supremacy, would have been afraid of Bonner's threat of excommunication.—This is by no means unlikely. If, on one occasion, he acted without regard to the threat of excommunication in order to keep possession of his see, it does not follow that he would do so again, when so great an interest was not at stake. Besides, although he had incurred the penalty of excommunication, by taking the oath of supremacy, it does not appear that that sentence had been *actually* pronounced upon him. Now Bonner's excommunication was to be *actually* fulminated by Neal.

It does not appear probable that Kitchen would have been moved by the threat of a man in prison, as Bonner then was.—There is no improbability in the supposition, when that threat was of a spiritual character, the execution of which could not be prevented by Bonner's imprisonment.

Bonner could not have had a chaplain, while he was confined in the tower.—Why not?

Bonner and Neal would thus have incurred the penalty of a *præmunire;* now this penalty was never inflicted on them.—A man who, like Bonner, exchanged a palace for a prison, rather than violate his conscience, was not likely to care much for a *præmunire.* There were obvious reasons for not enforcing the law.

Mr. Neal, who says he was present, could not say whether it was on the head or shoulders.—Let any one place a large book on the *inclined head* of a person kneeling, and he will be able to say, "head *or* shoulders," precisely as Mr. Neal.

Ward makes the Nag's head consecration to have taken place before the 9th of September, whereas the queen's commission did not issue before the 6th of December following. Whether Ward is right or not, makes no matter in this investigation. The commission of the 9th of September proves that the consecration, if any ever took place, must have been shortly after the 9th of that

month. As to the commission of the 6th December, its authenticity is, at least, very doubtful.

It is not reasonable to believe that Neal would have been permitted to be present on the occasion.—However unable we may be to account for the circumstance, we are not surely on that account to reject a fact vouched for by respectable testimony. Did not Bonner order Neal to remain during the whole proceeding?—and can any one now undertake to say that Neal could not have done so, without the consent of the new bishops? From the testimony of Father Faircloth, it appears, that, besides Neal, others were present. Nor need this surprise us, if we remember that a few witnesses were desirable, or rather indispensable, had Landaff consented to consecrate the new prelates; and that the unexpected disappointment may have rendered them less wary than, in other circumstances, they would have been.

Kellison, who is said by some Protestant writers to have been the first inventor of the story, before he mentioned it in his controversy with Sutcliff, dwelt principally on the want of a due form, and not on the want of a consecrating prelate.—It is not unusual for disputants to omit the discussion of a matter of fact, when they have objections, which establish their point, even in the *supposition* that the disputed fact actually occurred.

The silence of the Puritans in their disputes with the early English bishops is urged.—The point in dispute between them, regarded rather the character of the Episcopal order, than the necessity of Episcopal consecration; about which there was not, for many years after, any essential difference between Anglicans and Presbyterians.* In the 'Demonstration of Discipline,' pub-

* The second of Archbishop Whitgift's Articles, for the visitation of the diocese of Chichester, in 1585, contains, says Dr. Cardwell, "one of the earliest declarations from authority against orders conveyed by presbyters." In 1578, Whittingham had his orders called into question; but he shielded himself by the provisions of 13 Eliz., c. 12, already referred to. In 1584, it was one among the charges preferred against Travers. Whitgift silenced Whittingham, who appealed to the privy council, "but the queen," says Dr. Cardwell, "would not suffer the decision (of the archbishop,) to be disturbed." In 1582, Archbishop Grindal licensed John Morrison, who had been ordained by the hands of presbyters in Scotland, to officiate in the province of Canterbury.—Strype; Grindal, p. 596. Lord Bacon, in his advertisement concerning the controversies of the Church of England, (written probably about 1590,) blames the indiscretion of those who questioned foreign, i. e. Presbyterian orders. Instances of foreigners holding preferment, without episcopal ordination, may be given down to the middle of the seventeenth century. The 13 and 14 Charles II., c. 4, rendered such ordinations indispensable for the future.—Bancroft's Sermons, 588–9. "Up to this period," says Dr. Cardwell, "it

lished about the middle of this reign, (see Heylin's History of the Presbyterians, lib. 8, p. 284,) it is said, as quoted by Fitzsimmons, in his Brittannomachia, p. 317, that "the profane order of bishops now in England received its origin and progress in a corner and not in a congregation."—Cap. 8, § 2, p. 13. In the petition of the commons to the upper house of parliament, about the same time, we find at the end of the fourth article the following demand, "and lastly, that the ordinations be publicly performed, and not in any private house or chapel."*

It is improbable that the new bishops would have chosen to be consecrated in a tavern, when they had all the churches of London at their disposal. I have already anticipated this objection in the preliminary observations. I shall now add, that Kitchin may have had a sufficient motive for wishing to please the Queen, and at the same time, to avoid the odium of publicly consecrating heretical bishops, not to speak now of the excommunication which he knew Bonner would most certainly inflict, were he publicly to exercise functions within the diocese of London.

There was no need to have recourse to the Catholic bishops, as there were enough of Protestant bishops to perform the function; namely, Barlow, Hodgkins, Coverdale, Scory, Bale of Ossory, or the Suffragan of Thetford. Besides, if no English bishops were willing, or empowered, to consecrate Parker, recourse might have been had to Ireland, where the bishops generally conformed to the religious changes of Elizabeth, and had received a consecration of undeniable validity.

It is admitted by all that the consecration of Parker was an affair of no small difficulty: it would have been of no difficulty whatsoever were the facts supposed in this objection true. With regard to the English Protestant bishops, we have reason to believe that they were not considered as bishops even by the Queen,—and that the only bishop in England who had been consecrated according to the Roman Pontifical, was Kitchin of Landaff, as may be gathered from the works of Fulke,† Heylin,‡

had been usual to consider bishops and priests as of the same order."—Doc. Ann., Vol. II., pp. 4, 5.

* Collier. † Dodd, III., p. 73.

‡ Queen Elizabeth seems to have made little or no account of these supposed bishops. Hence, she chose not any one of them to perform the ceremony of her coronation; but received the crown from the hands of a Catholic bishop, Oglethorpe, the only one of the episcopal body who would assist at the consecration.

and Harding. This might be shewn with regard to all here mentioned; as it has been shewn in chapter V., with regard to Barlow—the only person whose episcopal character at all affects the question.

I stated in my former work that some Catholic writers had asserted, before the appearance of Mason's work in 1613, that "the most Rev. Dr. Creagh, Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, who was then a prisoner in the Tower of London, was applied to by Parker, with the hope of receiving from him episcopal consecration; and that this the venerable prelate firmly refused." I remarked that Mason inserted this in his work, without meeting it with a denial. Mr. Evans replies, that Creagh was not bishop in 1559. Probably not: but as the matter is not necessarily connected with the present subject, a further discussion of it may be avoided. Certain it is, as stated by Mr. Evans, on the authority of Mr. Haddan, the recent editor of Bramhall's works, that Sanders, thirty years after the date assigned for Parker's consecration, published that "they (the new bishops) were very instant with an Irish archbishop, to have presided at their ordination; but he would not."* Whether the person referred to was Creagh or not, is immaterial, as far as the present investigation is concerned. This assertion of Sanders is another indication of the nature of the exception which he and the other Catholic writers of his time took to the orders of the new church—the want of a proper consecrator.

Mr. Evans supposes that if the bishops who he believes actually performed the consecration had refused, the Irish bishops—all of whom, Palmer says, with the exception of two—and these 'intruders'—conformed to the Reformation, would have done it. It is to be observed, 1st. That the act acknowledging the Queen's supremacy was not passed in the Irish Parliament until the following Jan., (1559–1560) a month after the time assigned for the commission to consecrate Parker. 2d. MacGeoghegan gives the following statement, which is very different from that on which Mr. Evans has relied: "Queen Elizabeth was particularly desirous of having

"It cannot," says Heylin, "be denied that there were three bishops living of King Edward's making, all of them zealously affected to the reformation. And possibly it may seem strange that the queen received not the crown rather from one of their hands, than to put herself unto the hazard of so many denials as had been given her by the others."—P. 106. He then assigns some possible reasons for the queen's preference, but brings nothing to prove that these motives influenced her choice.

* Bramhall's Works, Vol. III., p. 47; new edition.

the Protestant religion established in Ireland. She sent orders to Sussex (1560) to call a meeting of the clergy for that purpose: but the firmness of the bishops, and their attachment to the ancient religion rendered the attempt abortive, notwithstanding the offers that were made in order to bribe them. After this meeting, William Walsh, a native of Waterford, and bishop of Meath, who was particularly zealous in the Catholic cause, having preached at Trim, in his own diocese, against the book of Common Prayer, was arrested, thrown into prison, and deposed shortly afterwards by order from the Queen."*

Fitzsimmons, an Irish writer, asserts in a work published in 1614, that there was no protestant bishop in Ireland at the time spoken of.† John Bale, Bishop of Ossory, mentioned in the supposed commission of 6th December, was named by Edward VI., to that see, towards the latter end of his reign in 1552–3; and there is every reason to believe that he never was ordained. It is true, Cox says, that he was ordained by the Archbishop of Armagh, assisted by two other Catholic bishops.‡ But Ware, a much more trustworthy author, assures us that George Dowdal, the Archbishop of Armagh, retired from Ireland, and lived beyond the seas, during the reign of Edward; whence, on the accession of Mary, he was recalled by her in 1553. Bale is said by Robert Croke to have been consecrated on the 2d February, 1553, under Edward VI. No act relating to this alleged consecration is found in Rymer—neither *significavit*, nor writ of restitution to temporalities. In the catalogue of English writers, attributed to him, a work certainly antedated,§ he is named Bishop of Ossory, in Ireland; but this work, for the reason just mentioned, is of little authority.

In the year 1604, Holliwood, (Sacrobosco) published an answer made by Bishop Bancroft to Mr. Wm. Alabaster, who asked him, "how Parker and his colleagues were consecrated bishops?" Bancroft replied: "I hope that in case of necessity, a priest may

* Ware de Episcop., Mid.; apud McGeo., p. 462.

† Brittannomachia, p. 331.

‡ "Bale, Bishop of Ossory, was consecrated by the popish Bishops of Armagh, Kildare, and Down."—Richard Cox, Hist. of the Church of Ireland; apud Le Quien, p. 315.

§ The date of this work, a copy of which is in the Loganian Library, of Philadelphia, is 1557—both in the preface and at the end of the work. And yet it is dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, who did not ascend the throne until November 1558. In it, Tunstal, the deprived bishop of Durham, is stated to have died in 1556, whereas his death took place in 1559.

ordain bishops." "The allusion," says Holliwood, "was evidently intended for Scory, the consecrator at the Nag's head. This book of Sacrobosco's was published during Bancroft's life; but not a word of denial or disclaimer ever proceeded from him."*

I adduced, in my former work, without however placing any, much less my chief, reliance on it, as Mr. Evans has not hesitated to state, the relation of a circumstance connected with this singular history. I give it now, in precisely the same form as before, and for the same purpose, to put the reader in possession of all the facts connected with the history of this curious controversy.

The author of "The Nullity of the Prelatic Clergy," (Talbot, Archbishop of Dublin,) the same writer who relates the answer of Bishop Bancroft to Alabaster, says, that upon occasion of a certain book, brought into the Parliament house by some presbyterian lords, *proving that the Protestant bishops had no succession or consecration*, and therefore were *no bishops*, and consequently had *no right* to sit in Parliament; Dr. Morton, Bishop of Durham, made a speech against the said book, in behalf of himself and all the bishops then present. In which speech he endeavoured to prove their succession from the last Catholic bishops, who, says he, by imposition of hands, ordained the first Protestant bishops at the Nag's head, in Cheapside, as was notorious to all the world. This was reported by an ancient peer, then present in the house."†

Shortly afterwards Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, published his 'Consecration and Succession of Protestant bishops justified,' in which he contents himself with denying the words attributed to Bancroft, by merely saying, "I do not believe one word of Bishop Bancroft;" and with regard to Dr. Morton, he brings a certificate under his own hand, denying that he had ever made the speech attributed to him by the aforesaid author. He also adduces the testimony of some noblemen and bishops, attesting, that they did not remember that such a book against bishops, as is there mentioned, was presented to that Parliament; and therefore Dr. Morton could not have made any speech against it. To this denial the said author of *The Nature of Catholic Faith and Heresy*, in another treatise, entitled, *The Nullity of the Prelatic Clergy and Church of England*, printed at Antwerp, in 1669, replied. In this work we find a testimony of Lord Audley, signed

* Nature of Catholic Faith and Heresy. Rouen, 1657, ch. 2, p. 8.
† Ibid. p. 9.

with his hand, in which he directly contradicts the denial of Dr. Morton; because he himself (Lord Audley) was present on the occasion referred to, and heard that prelate speak in the manner already mentioned. Although the testimony of Lord Audley is long, I shall here insert it at full.

"Having seen a book entitled *The Consecration and Succession of Protestant Bishops, etc.*, and particularly perused that chapter called *The Vindication of the Bishop of Durham*, I find myself (reflecting on some assertion therein, and the Bishop of Derry, author,) obliged to say something as concerned, and so have desired place here for a few lines. Whom the author of the Treatise of the Catholic Faith, etc., fixed on to prove his allegations touching the Bishop of Durham's speech, I know not; for he told me of it, before ever I spoke to him; but sure I am, if it be looked after, he may have sufficient authority to satisfy half a dozen of juries; but that which stirs me to speak in this matter, is a note I have, at the request of the Bishop of Derry, given him under my hand, wherein I say in substance the same with the author, touching the Bishop of Durham's speech. As for the book against episcopacy, which was the ground of the discourse, my note only avers that it was brought into the house, but says not by whom, nor who was the author. In truth, I wondered much to find that the Bishop of Durham doth deny this speech; for I cannot remember that I ever heard of, or read, the story of the Nag's head, till that day in Parliament of my Lord Durham, and then I heard it from him; and this I say, as I shall answer for it before the judgment seat of God Almighty. And I do not remember that ever I heard the Bishop of Lincoln, or any other bishop, before or since, mention the Nag's head, or touch upon that story. If I had, and not named him, my Lord of Durham might have just reason to complain; but my Lord of Derry will not believe that I (for I cannot but take it to myself,) do, or ever did, know the Bishop of Durham so well, as to swear this was the man. If his lordship had been an English bishop, and frequented parliaments, he would have omitted this. Not to multiply words, I can assure his lordship, I could as well and as surely have sworn this is the man, the bishop of Durham, as his lordship could of Sir George Radcliff when he lived. Besides, his person and place of the bishop's bench is too eminent to be mistaken. Another expression of my lord of Derry is;—'I do not take

myself to be so exact an analyser of a discourse, as to be able to take my oath what was the true scope of it.' Here, likewise, I must beg his lordship's pardon. I know no such defect in myself; for there is not any thing more easy than to comprehend the true scope of a short, plain, historical discourse, as this was. To conclude, as to the bishop of Durham's denial, I hope, that confessing himself now of the age of ninety-five years, it will be held no crime to say, or improbable to believe, that one of that great age may at least forget what he spake so many years since. For the two *certificates* of the other lords, that of the temporal [lords] say little to my lord of Derry's purpose; neither with an indifferent (impartial) judgment can that of the spiritual (lords, i. e. bishops) work much. For my part, I do not say that any or all their lordships, whose names are put to the *certificate* in the book, were in the house at the time; or, if any of them were, that they took notice of what my lord of Durham spake; for many discourses are made in Parliament, and little notice taken of them; neither had I of this, but that it was to me a new thing. The clerk of the Parliament is also brought in to certify, though as to my note, his pains might have been spared; for I do not mention a book *presented*, and, consequently, none to be recorded; and as for speeches, I do assure his lordship, on the authority of an old Parliament man, that it is not the office of the clerk to record them, (his work would be too great) till it be a result or a conclusion, and then he writes them down as orders, ordinances, etc. of parliament. I will end the short and faithful defence which I have been necessitated to make for myself, with many thanks to my lord of Derry for his charity and opinion of my ingenuity ('honesty,') and seeing his lordship's inclination in this matter is to absolve me from a malicious lie, I will absolve him as to the mistakes either in the person or matter, assuring his lordship and all the world, that there is none." The temperate and Christian tone of this defence is no bad voucher of its truth.

Mr. Evans very naturally rejects this relation, the inherent improbability of which, he says, would not be removed, although twenty Lord Audleys had sworn to it. Probability however, is not always an unerring criterion of truth, which is said to be, sometimes, stranger than fiction. *Le vrai n'est pas toujours le vraisemblable.* Dr. Morton was consecrated by Archbishop Abbott in 1616, just three years after the appearance of Mason's

work. He may not have had his attention turned to this production, which, as I have already shown, gave a new feature to the ordination controversy ; or he may have thought that records of a questionable character were not to be preferred to the opinion he is said to have expressed. It is difficult to conceive how such a story could have originated in any other circumstance than the event it narrates.

In the commission of 27th September, 6th October, and 9th October, the see of Canterbury is supposed to be vacant, but this is easily accounted for, even in the supposition that the Nag's head consecration took place in September, as is generally believed, either by supposing that the inthronization, until which the see was not properly filled, did not immediately follow, or that the hole-and-corner character of the consecration caused the fact to be overlooked by the persons charged with the expedition of the commissions in question.

Leaving the reader to judge of the relative force of the various arguments advanced for and against the truth of the Nag's head narrative, I shall conclude in the words of Dodd :

" Whatever mistakes several Catholic writers may have lain under in regard of the Nag's head story, and Parker's register, or of any particular facts relating to those matters, it can neither affect their reputation nor their cause in the main. They have offered so many plausible arguments for the asserting of the one and the rejecting of the other, that the pains taken by the adverse party to disprove them, does sufficiently excuse them from the personal reflections of insincerity or calumny."*

* Dodd, Vol. II., App. ccxci.

CHAPTER VIII.

MISSION.

Mr. Evans concludes his reply to the first edition of this work, by an essay on the subject of Mission, which imposes on me the necessity of giving this point a more extended notice than I had originally intended. The question is; presupposing the validity of their orders, have the bishops and clergy of the Church by law established in England, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, the right to exercise the functions of the ministry? It is a fortunate circumstance that the distinction between the *power* of order, and the *right* to exercise such power, or jurisdiction, is explicitly recognized by Mr. Evans, who adopts Hooker's statement: "there are but two things observed in every ecclesiastical function, *power* to exercise the duty itself, and *some charge of people* whereon to exercise the same."* Supposing, for a moment, that the Anglican clergy have the *power*, whence have they received the *charge of people* whereon to exercise it? It is this combination of power and right, communicated in an uninterrupted series from the apostles to our days, which constitutes apostolical succession; and hence this combination must have existed at all times since their days, or the idea of apostolical suc-

* Essays, p. 239.—Another writer, whose sentiments Mr. Evans adopts, says: "This assigning to men, having the power of order, the persons to whom they were to minister holy things, and of whom they were to take the care, and the subjecting of such persons unto them gave them the power of jurisdiction, which they had not before."—Field on the Church, quoted by Mr. Evans, p. 240. He also cites the following passage from Mr. Palmer, of Worcester College, England:—"It certainly is essential that the true ministers of God should be able to prove that they have not only the *power*, but the *right*, of performing sacred offices. There is an evident difference between these things as may be seen by the following cases.—If a regularly ordained priest should celebrate the eucharist in the church of another, contrary to the will of that person and of the bishop, he would have the power of consecrating the eucharist, it actually would be consecrated, but he would not have the right of consecration: or, in other words, he would not have *mission* for that act. If a bishop should enter the diocese of another bishop, and, contrary to his will, ordain one of his deacons to the priesthood, the intruding bishop would have the *power*, but not the *right*, of ordaining—he would have no mission for such an act."—Ant. of Engl. Ritual, Vol. II., p. 247. Oxford, 1839.

cession must be abandoned. Absolutely speaking, there might be apostolic ministry without apostolical succession. Men might have the same power and right to exercise ministerial functions as the apostles had, because God, who gave it to the apostles, might give to others, by other means than by communication from the apostles; but unless this power and right were transmitted in continuous succession from the apostles to our days, there could not be apostolical succession. This combined power and right may be fitly illustrated by a canal through which water flows. Without the canal, there would be no current of water; and if the canal be cut off, or the water diverted into other channels, or otherwise cease to flow in it, the canal, as such, loses all its value, although it still is a conduit through which water might, but does not, flow. So in the case before us. Without valid orders, there can be no ministry; but valid orders may exist without the right to exercise them; and hence they do not necessarily imply ministry, taken in its full and only salutary sense, of men having the *power* and *right* to exercise ecclesiastical functions. A very common error on this subject, and one into which Mr. Evans falls on more than one occasion,* is, that orders confer jurisdiction, unless there be some impediment to obstruct or paralyze their influence. In this theory, ordination is the living spring, whence jurisdiction flows as from a fountain. The gushing of the spring may be obstructed by some temporary and accidental cause, but the source cannot be dried up; and whenever the impediment which hinders it from flowing is removed, it will burst forth with its original energy and salubriousness. This, I believe, is a fair illustration of the fallacious principle by which it is sought to infer the existence of jurisdiction from the fact of ordination; a principle, however, which is equally opposed to the fact, that Christ gave the power of order and the power of jurisdiction by separate acts, and that the Church, from the beginning, has recognized these two powers as perfectly distinct and separable. When Christ said to the apostles, "Do this in commemoration of me;" "Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them," He gave them the power of *order*, according to the consent of divines. He assigned them a people, in whose regard this power was to be exercised; i. e., He gave them *jurisdiction*, when he said to Peter, "Feed my lambs;

* Essays, p. 246.

Feed my sheep;" and to all the apostles: "Teach all nations." Hence, the power of order can exist without jurisdiction; and jurisdiction of the highest character can be exercised, although the person vested with it may only be a clergyman of inferior rank. One who has received confirmation for a diocese, which he has been appointed to govern as bishop, has, by the very fact, plenary episcopal jurisdiction before he receives episcopal consecration; and can do every thing except those acts which require the episcopal character,—which belong not to jurisdiction,—equally before as after having been consecrated. A deacon appointed to the rectorship of a parish can exercise the jurisdiction of a pastor in it, although he must employ the ministry of a priest for those functions which require the sacerdotal character. A bishop or a priest may never have received jurisdiction, or having received it, may lose it, either by voluntary resignation or deprivation. These principles, I believe, are recognized by Anglican no less than by Catholic writers; and their simple statement is sufficient to show the fallacy of the position, that jurisdiction implies orders, and orders impart jurisdiction.

Anglican writers profess to derive their orders and mission through the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church; and their claim to apostolical succession is grounded on this supposed fact. That they might have derived their orders from the Catholic clergy, even in the supposition which these writers must necessarily make, that that clergy, during many ages, taught 'blasphemous fables,' instead of the pure Gospel, I can easily understand; but it really perplexes me when I endeavour to conceive how they can derive their mission, or right to exercise their orders, from the same impure source. Mr. Palmer, as quoted by Mr. Evans, lays down a principle, in itself self-evident, which, taken in connection with an authority which both these gentlemen must receive, shows that the Roman Catholic Church could not give a mission to the Anglican clergy, for the simple but all sufficient reason, that she had none to give. Mr. Palmer's words are: "In fact, mission fails in all schismatical, heretical, and uncanonical acts, because God cannot have given any man a right to act in opposition to those laws, which He Himself has enacted, or to those which the Apostles and their successors have instituted, for the orderly and peaceable regulation of the Church; He is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all the churches of the saints; and yet, were He to

commission His ministers to exercise their offices in whatever places and circumstances they pleased, confusion and division without end must be the inevitable result."—*Ant. of Engl. Ritual*, Vol. ii. p. 248.

The 35th of the thirty-nine articles declares that the book of Homilies "doth contain a godly and wholesome doctrine," and this book of Homilies contains the following plain statement as to the religious world before "Gospel-light beamed from Boleyn's eyes:" "Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women and children, of whole Christendom, have been at once drowned in abominable and damnable idolatry, and that for the space of eight hundred years and more, to the destruction and subversion of all good religion universally."* If idolatry be not less hateful to God, or less destructive of divine institutions, than schism, surely all mission must have failed in the Roman Catholic Church, unless, like the waters of the fabled stream, it flowed on in an under current, and once more revisited the world, at the period, and under the respectable influence, above referred to.

I suppose, however, that the 'godly and wholesome doctrine' just quoted was, as the article says, "necessary for the times," when it first appeared, but that now it may be safely disused or disavowed; still it cannot be denied by the advocate of Anglicanism, that the acts of the Roman Catholic Church were either schismatical, heretical or uncanonical,—otherwise, why separate from her communion? Such being then *her* character, all mission, on Mr. Palmer's principle, which is a self-evident one, must have failed; and that church must have been incapable of communicating mission, because she had none whatever. Even in the erroneous supposition, which I have already refuted, that orders bring jurisdiction along with them, and that the impediment, in those who had orders, of heresy, schism, or uncanonicalness being removed, jurisdiction would revive, it would not be true that the mission had been continuous; and consequently, there could be no such thing as an apostolical succession; i. e. perpetual succession from the days of the apostles. The claim to such a succession is a palpable contradiction in those who, either expressly or by implication, regard the Roman Catholic Church, as having

* Against Peril of Idolatry.

been, for a single point of time, an idolatrous, schismatical or uncanonical communion.

To show still more clearly the utter futility of the claims to Apostolical Succession in the Anglican clergy, I shall accept for the sake of argument, the statement of Mr. Evans, and examine whether, on his own principles, that clergy have mission. This is, we will suppose, "conveyed by valid consecration; except where a canonical impediment intervenes. The canonical impediments are chiefly three;—that the see is full; that the consecrators had no right to fill it, being vacant; that the bishop elect was a schismatic, or heretic, and so incapable of mission."* Did any, or all, of these canonical impediments render the consecration of the first Anglican prelates, a nullity, as to jurisdiction?

Were the sees to which they were appointed by the Queen, vacant? The see of Canterbury was, indeed, vacant by the death of Cardinal Pole: not so the sees, from which the bishops had been driven by Elizabeth, because they would not take the oath recognizing her right to govern the Church. But it will be said: were not these bishops, thus expelled by Elizabeth, placed in the sees from which Mary had expelled their predecessors; and, consequently, were they not to be considered rather as intruders than as legitimate occupants of the sees they filled when Elizabeth ascended the throne? To this I reply: the bishops whom Mary had displaced, were removed, either because they held their sees, during the good pleasure of the crown, or, by reason of the nullity of their consecration, and violation of the canon law, and, consequently, were rightfully and canonically deprived of them, when they did not voluntarily resign them, as was sometimes the case. Not so the bishops removed by Elizabeth; they were removed under the provisions of the act 1 Eliz. c. 1, enjoining the oath of supremacy; and no canonical cause was assigned as the motive of their deprivation. They were, consequently true and lawful bishops, and the occupation of their sees by those whom Elizabeth named to fill them was an intrusion.

Were Parker and his fellows heretics and schismatics? I waive the inquiry, as I have no wish to divert the reader's attention from the object before us, by an examination which would open up the whole controversy between Catholics and Anglicans. I must,

* Essays, p. 246.

however, remark, that if Parker and the other bishops named by Elizabeth were not heretics and schismatics, there never was, and never can be, such a thing as heresy or schism. Considered as such they were, indeed, incapable of receiving mission—not orders, as Mr. Evans erroneously says. On this occasion, this gentleman makes a digression on the Pope's supremacy, and gives citations of ancient canons and modern commentaries thereon, to prove that the Elizabethan bishops were no schismatics: all of which, as irrevelant to the question, I very willingly pass by.*

To confine myself, then, to the see of Canterbury, and to but one of the impediments destructive of jurisdiction, had Parker's consecrators a right to fill it?—None whatever. They had, as Mr. Lewis remarks, as much right to make Parker archbishop of Milan, as of Canterbury. There was not a man of them, who, if he would exercise jurisdiction in the province of Canterbury, was not bound to receive 'mission' from Parker, its supposed archbishop, as most of them subsequently did; and there is not in the whole history of the church a more disgraceful sporting with the forms of ecclesiastical discipline, than that of Parker confirming, i. e. giving jurisdiction to those, who a few days before had confirmed himself.

"Before the consecration of Parker, the English prelates might," says Mr. Lewis, "perhaps, have insisted on their original jurisdiction, and, disregarding the statutes, claimed their authority, because they had been duly confirmed by prelates who had entered canonically into their respective sees. But in this case there is

* "To appeal to antiquity from the sentence of the present Church, is only a device to escape from all authority. He who should appeal from the sentence of the civil judges of the kingdom, to the writings of lawyers and judges who lived a hundred years ago, would not be more unreasonable in his conduct. If the early centuries were of authority to those then living, is there any reason why succeeding centuries should have none? If people were bound to obey the primitive bishops, are they not also bound to obey their successors? If it be meant to say that the authority of early ages is recognized only in times succeeding, it comes to this, that there is no present living authority in the Church, and that the next generation will be bound to reverence what the preceding one was equally bound to despise. If we appeal from our living rulers to the opinions of their predecessors, or even to their formal decisions, we appeal to an impossible tribunal, and deny the presence of Christ in His Church. It is not easy to give a reason why we should confine ourselves to the first three or four centuries, rather than to the fifth, or the tenth, or the nineteenth. If the Church be a living guide, and men be bound to obey those who are set over them, we must not appeal to antiquity after sentence is given. To hear the Church is not to consult the fathers, and obedience to her voice is not to set at naught present authority, when it seems to be not easily reconciled with the teaching of primitive bishops."—Lewis, notes, p. 93.

no shadow of ecclesiastical rule; the confirming bishops were unconfirmed themselves for twelve days after Parker's confirmation, and on the day of his consecration were not certain that even their election to their bishoprics would be allowed by the queen. They consecrated Parker December 17, but the royal assent to their election was not given till the next day. This confirmation of Parker was made by those who had no authority to make it; they were without any recognized jurisdiction, without any ascertainable dwelling place; they were not fugitives by reason of persecution, the civil power encouraged them, and, therefore, must come under the ecclesiastical language, which applies the word 'vagabond' to such as they were."

"On the supposition that they were true bishops, nay, to have been consecrated by the sovereign pontiff himself, and under no canonical disabilities, they could confer none upon Parker, and that defect must still adhere in Parker's successors; time cannot cure it. Original sin is not done away with by our distance from Adam, but by baptism; this defect of jurisdiction cannot be supplied by length of time, (*quod ab initio nullum est tractu temporis non convalescit,*) but by its acknowledgment as good, if it be so, by competent authority in the unity of the church."*

By denying the validity of Mary's deprivations, as well as the mission of some of the bishops consecrated in her reign, Mr. Evans endeavours to show that a majority of the true bishops of Canterbury, although not a single one of them was restored to the see of which he had been deprived under Mary, and every one of them, with the exception of Kitchin, required Parker's confirmation in the new sees to which they were appointed, concurred in Parker's confirmation; and, subsequently, affirms, that the circumstances of the case would have justified a minority in acting; all which seems better calculated to involve an unsuspicious reader in a worse than Cretan labyrinth, than to shed any favourable light on the indefensible misconduct of Parker and his consecrators in their sacrilegious usurpation.

It is wonderful how differently men judge of things, according as their prejudices incline them. An Anglican divine speaks of the deprivation of the nonjuring bishops under William III., in words which, I have no doubt, Mr. Evans would adopt, at least

* Notes, pp. 75, 76.

in reference to the case which called them forth; and yet would, probably refuse to apply to the case before us, although William had a much better right to deprive bishops who held their jurisdiction of the crown, than Elizabeth had to act so towards men who repudiated that principle.

"A decree," says Dr. Dodwell, "was made by a senate of laymen, that the bishops who refused to take the new oaths should be ejected out of their places. The time for taking them being expired, and these fathers refusing them, they are deprived of their palaces, revenues,—in short of all the rights annexed to their episcopal office. Hitherto we complained not. Let the secular hand reassume, if it pleases, what it bestowed on the church. This may hurt the temporal estate of the bishops, but can never affect the consciences of subjects; for Christ has laid no obligation on us to assert the legal rights of the bishops, in opposition to the magistrate; but certainly he has obliged us to assert those rights which he himself bestowed upon the church, in order to preserve it under persecution, and which no earthly power ever gave or was able to give. And yet the violence of our adversaries proceeded so far! Our reverend fathers were driven at last from the very cure of souls; altars opposite to theirs erected, and *bishops of an adverse party thrust into their places. Though they were alive, their seats were filled, and filled by colleagues, before they were vacant, before their predecessors were deprived of episcopal power by bishops who had authority to do it.* Upon this account we looked upon the obedience we owed them to be still valid, nor could we transfer it to their successors who had departed from Catholic unity, from Christ himself and all his benefits, according to the doctrine of St. Cyprian's age."*

"If the English nation," says Mr. Lewis, "would be tried by the principles of the canon law which they owned from the days of St. Augustine, to the latter years of the primacy of Warham, they must allow their bishops to have no jurisdiction, and each act of ordination, each administration of the sacraments, to be sacrilege. If their bishops were true bishops, and their clergy, true priests, their ministrations involve the users and the givers in deadly sin, unless the whole of Christendom have from the beginning misunderstood the Christian law."†

* Apud Cooper, p. 93. † Notes, p. 81.

"The Anglican prelates are disowned in the east and west, and no one owes them any obedience. They were thrust into the places they occupy by the civil power; they have no jurisdiction, and none but themselves recognize their orders."*

Distrustful of this position, Mr. Evans suggests another expedient by which the Anglican clergy may be supposed to have received mission. "There is still," says he, "another ground upon which the mission of the English prelates may be sustained. The Elizabethan bishops were, at the least, bishops without mission, and as such, at liberty to perform episcopal acts in vacant dioceses not subject to any archbishop, and countries not organized into dioceses. This principle, alone, would long since have removed all objections to the mission of the Church of England. Before the end of the sixteenth century, all the deprived bishops must have been dead; indeed it is probable that Watson, who is recorded to have survived his deprivation twenty-four years, survived them all. He was the youngest bishop amongst them except Poole, of Peterborough, who was consecrated at the same time with him. However these things may be, it is certain that a time came, when all the deprived bishops were dead. At that period, if the Romanists are right, all the archbishoprics and bishoprics in England were vacant. This was a state of things not to be tolerated. The sees must be filled by bishops, and any bishop might consecrate such, whether he had mission or not. For mission is only the right of exercising the episcopal office in a particular place, and a bishop may exercise his office in any place, where he can do so without intruding upon another bishop. It is only upon this principle that the Romanists can maintain the validity of their consecrations *in partibus infidelium*."†

The two principles on which the foregoing argument is grounded are curious discoveries in the department of canon law. Vacant sees must be filled, on the principle, I presume, of the old

* Notes, p. 94.

† Essays, p. 258.—The words *in partibus infidelium*, are applied, not to a consecration, but to a bishop. Such a one is consecrated to the title of a see, now, in the "parts or power of unbelievers," and is employed *elsewhere* to aid some other bishop in his functions. This practice is grounded on the principle, that there cannot be more than one bishop for a see; although age, infirmity, extent of diocese, or some other canonical cause, may render it necessary to have a second bishop to aid the bishop of the place. This second bishop is called "Co-adjutor," because he *helps* the bishop who has the title of the see. The co-adjutor has also the title of *a* see, but of a see that is *in partibus infidelium*, an expression that applies to a place where he is not, and not to the place where he is.

philosophy, applied to Church government, that bishoprics, like nature, abhor a vacuum. A bishop without mission, i. e. without the right to exercise the office of bishop, may exercise that office, and give to another what he himself has not. Mr. Evans, not content with giving Catholics a name which they do not acknowledge, and which, he knows, they deem insulting, attributes to them the principles he here enunciates, if, indeed, such assumptions and contradictions deserve the name of principle. Elsewhere he speaks of vacant sees as if they were so many animals, *feræ naturæ*, and became the property of the first who seized on them; and grounds a charge of schism against the Catholic bishops of the United States on this curious principle.

But why did Mr. Evans overlook the only source whence the prelates in question looked for mission, and, such as it was, derived it. It was not from the majority or minority of the bishops of the province of Canterbury that Parker expected to derive his right to exercise the power of primate; nor was it on any abstract principle, however absurd or contradictory of what had hitherto passed in Christendom, as the rule of conduct on such occasion, that he sought to justify his intrusion; but it was to his Royal Mistress that he looked, as the source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and his conduct, when viewed in the light of this principle, however culpable and otherwise absurd, is not at least inconsistent. It was not Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgskins, that confirmed Parker; nor was it Parker that subsequently confirmed them. In both instances it was the Queen, who employed these men to confirm each other, not as principals, but as agents of her supreme will. This they themselves, in the confirmation of Parker, acknowledged, and proclaimed: "We confirm the aforesaid election of the same venerable man, Master Mathew Parker, *by the supreme authority of the said Serene Lady Our Queen committed to us in this behalf.*"* This Parker himself acknowledged, under the solemn sanction of an oath; in which he recognized Elizabeth as having given him "as well the spiritualities as the temporalities of the see."†

* "Prædictam electionem de eodem vener. viro Mag. Math. Parker (ut præfertur) factam et celebratam, suprema authoritate dictæ Ser. D. N. Reginæ nobis in hac parte commissa confirmamus."—See Appendix, XII.

† The following words are contained in the oath of homage made by Parker and the other prelates to Queen Elizabeth:—"I acknowledge and confess to have and to hold the said archbishopric of Canterbury, and the possessions of the same

It is this undeniable fact that, of itself, and apart from every other inquiry, is destructive of the claim to apostolical succession so confidently made by that class of Church of England men who assume the contradictory appellation of Anglo-Catholic. The State made that Church; from the State it derives all its powers; nor can it lay claim to a distinct and independent existence; it being, when properly understood, nothing more than a State department for ecclesiastical affairs. That such is the case, will be most plainly seen in the proofs by which I shall establish the two following propositions.

I. The Church of England derives all the power she claims from the State, nor does she, as a Church, refuse to acknowledge the fact.

II. The Church of England, in her doctrine and discipline, must observe whatever the State prescribes; nor can she, without ceasing to exist, propose a single item of doctrine, or enforce a single point of discipline on her own authority.

If these propositions can be established, the claim to apostolical succession on the part of the Anglican Church, and of every Church deriving its jurisdiction from or through it, must be abandoned: that Church must be regarded as a purely human institution—a function of the State rather than a separate and independent existence. Nor does the fact that ecclesiastics are employed by the State in this department, give a strictly ecclesiastical character to their functions, no more than, as was the case in former days, did the ecclesiastics who sat on the judicial bench impart a spiritual character to the administration of law.*

I. We have already seen what was the nature of the royal supremacy, in regard to the episcopal body, claimed and exercised by Henry VIII. and Edward VI., and basely acquiesced in by the unworthy churchmen of their days. In order, however, the better to understand the entire force of the term "Supreme Head of the Church of England,"† applied to Henry by the Convocation

entirely, as well the *spiritualities as temporalities thereof, only* of your majesty and crown royal of this realm."—Lewis's Notes, etc., p. 48.

* For the facts and authorities cited in the sequel of this chapter, I am principally indebted to two very valuable productions of comparatively recent date; *The Anglican Church, the Creature and Slave of the State;* by Rev. P. Cooper, of the Church of the Conception, Dublin; Prebendary, etc; London, Dolman, 1844; and *Notes on the Nature and Extent of the Royal Supremacy in the Anglican Church*; by David Lewis, M. A.; London, Toovey, 1847.

† Ecclesiæ et cleri Anglicani, cujus singularem protectorem unicum et supremum

in 1531, as that word was afterwards expounded by themselves, and recognized by Parliament, we have only to read the submission which they made to him, in the following words:

"We offer and promise in verbo sacerdotii, (on the word of the priesthood,) hereunto your highness submitting ourselves most humbly to the same, that we will never from henceforth enact, put in use, promulge, or execute any new canons or constitution, provincial, or any other new ordinance, provincial, or synodal, in our convocations or synod, in time coming; which convocation is, alway hath been, and *must* be assembled *only* by your high commandment of writ: only your highness, by your royal assent, shall license us to assemble our convocation, and to make, promulge, and execute such constitutions and ordinaments as shall be made in the same, and thereto give your royal assent and authority. Secondarily, that, whereas, divers of the constitutions, ordinaments, and canons, provincial or synodal, which have been heretofore enacted, but thought to be not only much prejudicial to your prerogative royal, but also overmuch onerous to your highness' subjects; your clergy aforesaid is contented, if it may stand so with your highness' pleasure, that it be committed to the examination and judgment of your grace, and of thirty-two persons, whereof sixteen to be of the upper and nether house of the temporality, and other sixteen of the clergy, *all to be chosen and appointed by your most noble grace;* so that, finally, whichsoever of the said constitutions, ordinaments, or canons, provincial or synodal, shall be thought and determined by your grace, and by the most part of the said thirty-two persons, not to stand with God's law and the law of your realm, the same to be abrogated and taken away by your grace and the clergy; and such of them as shall be seen by your grace and by the most part of the said thirty-two persons to stand with God's laws and the laws of your realm, to stand in full strength and power, your grace's most royal assent and authority once impetrate fully given to the same."*

dominum, et quantum per Christi legem licet, etiam supremum caput ipsius majestatem recognoscimus.—Wilkins' Conc., III., 742–745.

* Wilkins, III., 754, 755.—The Act of Parliament in which this submission was subsequently embodied, implicitly contradicts the falsehood, that the canon law was opposed to the law of God or of the realm, which this submission of the clergy so shamelessly asserts, in order to give the tyrant on the throne the power to set all law and order at defiance. That act provides that the canon law shall continue in force until new laws on the subject be enacted, which has not been done up to the present day. Hence it is that the canon law has, perhaps, more force at the

"With the title of Supreme Head of the Church of England," says Mr. Lewis, "the King obtains corresponding powers: the clergy give him authority over their deliberations; a negative voice in all their proceedings and power to review and suspend the past. All laws and constitutions of the English Church, then in force, were liable to abrogation by the King's supreme authority, and the obsolete legislation of the past liable, at the same bidding, to be quickened into life. The Church of England, in convocation represented, surrendered deliberately all her jurisdiction into secular hands; depriving herself of the power to make canons for her own guidance, and of accepting the sentence even of an œcumenical council, unless with the consent of the supreme civil authority."

"The king, by passing a law in parliament, wherein was inserted the submission, obtained its recognition by the whole nation. The king and his nobles, the prelates and the clergy, together with the rest of the people, agree to consider the church as a function of the civil power: by a law of the kingdom the authority of the Catholic Church is denied. Setting aside for the present the question of the supremacy of the Holy See, and taking only the lowest view of ecclesiastical authority, which supposes it to be in the whole church diffusive; here even then, is a clear denial of that authority over the English Church, and, instead of it, is set up a power, new and strange, hitherto unheard of in Christendom. No canons, however important, could now be published in England without the king's consent; no heresy, however deadly, could be now condemned if the king willed it not; the English Church, as such, could hold no synod without being summoned by him, so that he seems to have the power by law and canon of finally suppressing the Church of England. It is no answer here that so might the persecutors of the church have done for in such cases,

present day in England, than in any country professedly Catholic. All the decisions of the ecclesiastical courts, and of civil courts in regard of ecclesiastical affairs, are grounded on it; the decrees of Popes, and the opinions of Catholic canonists are appealed to; and their authority or force unhesitatingly admitted. The following is the process by which the law in such cases is discovered:—"The business upon this head must be to inquire, first, what is the canon law upon any point, *and then*, to find out how far the same was received here before the said statute, (act of submission;) *and then*, to compare the same with the common law, and with the statute law, and with the law concerning the king's prerogative, (which is also part of the common law,) and from thence will come out the genuine law of the Church."—Burns' Ecclesiastical Law, Pref., p. xxxv.

the church was not consenting, while that of England left itself at the king's disposal—bound to do nothing against his authority."*

This surrender of its powers on the part of the clergy became the law of the land by the 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, called the '*Act of submission*' from its title on the rolls of parliament, '*An act for the submission of the clergie to the king's majestie.*'† In the preamble to the 24 Henry VIII. c. 12, whereby appeals to Rome were forbidden, the realm of England is declared to be governed by one supreme head and king, unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporality owe obedience, the king whereof is instituted and furnished by God with plenary whole and entire power and jurisdiction to render final determination in all manner of causes; the body spiritual thereof having power in spirituals, and the body temporal in temporals. The intent of this act, which, as Mr. Lewis observes, anticipated a theory of Hobbes,‡ on the concentration of all power in the temporal ruler, was to prepare the way for the long expected sentence of divorce; which, as Henry could not obtain from Rome, he resolved to obtain from Cranmer, whom he had made primate, for this special purpose. In his letter to the archbishop, committing to him the adjudication of the question, he declares that he (the primate) is "*the most principal minister of his*" (*the king's*) *spiritual jurisdiction*,§ whom he accordingly directs to proceed in the affair.

By the act of 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, as already stated, all appeals to Rome were forbidden: by the 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, appeals from the archbishop's court were to be made to the king's majesty and the king's court of chancery, upon which a commission was to issue "under the Great Seal, to such persons as should be named by the

* Notes, 12, 26.

† The king was determined to bind his fetters in such a manner, that no strength or artifice on the part of his prisoner should enable him to escape from them; and we know from the subsequent history of the Church, and the many fruitless attempts which have been made to obtain a relaxation of them, that the king's design has been eminently successful."—Cardwell, *Synodalia;* apud Cooper. "First, then, in consequence of this statute, the convocation can only be assembled by the king's writ. Secondly: when assembled, it cannot proceed to make new canons without a royal license, which is quite a separate act from the permission to assemble. Thirdly: having agreed upon the canons, they cannot be published or take effect, until confirmed by the sovereign. Fourthly: even with the royal authority, no canon can be enacted against the laws and customs of the land or the king's prerogative."—History of the Convocation, by Rev. Thomas Lathbury, p. 115.

‡ Book III., 42, p. 546. § Collier, Vol. II., Records, No. 24.

king's highness, his heirs or successors, *like as in case of appeals from the admiral's court*, to hear and definitively determine such appeals, and the causes concerning the same." Appeals also from exempt places were not to be made to the bishops, but to the king in chancery; and, says the statute, "no archbishop or bishop of this realm shall intermit or meddle with any such appeals, otherwise or in any other manner than they might have done afore the making of this act."*

Although the act of 25 Henry VIII., c. 20, has been already frequently referred to in the course of this work, it may not be useless on the present occasion briefly to describe its provisions. By it the ancient custom of electing bishops by the chapters, to whom the king was wont to issue a writ of *congé d'élire*, was virtually abolished; the chapter being bound to elect the person designated by the king; and that, within twelve days from the date of the writ, otherwise, each member of the chapter refusing to elect incurred the penalty of *præmunire*.† On the chapter's election, a writ to any archbishop and two bishops, or else to four bishops of the realm was to issue, enjoining them "to *confirm* the said election, and to invest and consecrate the said person so elected to the office and dignity that he is elected unto, and to give and use to him all such benedictions, ceremonies and other things requisite for the same, without any suing, procuring or obtaining any bulls, letters, or other things, from the see of Rome for the same in any behalf." The penalty of *præmunire* was the consequence, if this command was not complied with within

* "The first statute of appeals, (passed the year before Henry separated from the Catholic Church,) expressly limits the cognizance of spiritual matters to spiritual persons. The second statute, which entitles the king to the ultimate cognizance by commission, does not limit him to any person, but leaves him wholly to his own choice."—Gibson's *Codex Juris Anglicani;* apud Cooper.

† "Bishop Gibson's gloss upon this statute is: 'This is *wholly new;* and the only choice the electors have, under this restraint, is, whether they will obey the king, or incur a *præmunire*.' Or, as Dr. Johnson has more facetiously expressed it, the Church has about the same choice in the election of her chief ministers, that a man flung out of a window has to choose a soft seat for himself when he gets to the bottom. In fact, the *congé d' élire* is but a toy flung by the State to the overgrown children of the cathedrals."—*Cooper*, p. 65. It is not necessary to remind the reader, of the recent illustration this observation has received, in the election of Dr. Hampden to Hereford; which was followed by the still more humiliating scene of his confirmation in the Court of Arches; where it was ruled, that, although an invitation to propose objections against the elect should be given, agreeably to ancient usage, those who sat in that court could not permit any objection to be made; their duty being to confirm the elect, under penalty of *præmunire!*

twenty days. In the vacancy of an archbishop's see, the same order was to be observed, and even the pallium was to be given by the royal authority. Should the chapter refuse to elect, then this act empowered the king to issue his letters patent, *nominating* the person he designed to raise to the vacant see, and ordering his consecration; in which case no confirmation was necessary, the king doing by himself, what, in case of election, he would have done by others.

The next statute, 25 Henry VIII., c. 21, provides that all dispensations hitherto had from Rome should be had in England, and not elsewhere. The archbishop was empowered to grant them to the king, and, after good and due examination, to his subjects, but not in any cause or matter repugnant to the law of Almighty God. Should any dispensation be sought for, such as hitherto had not been obtained from the Holy See, the archbishop is directed to acquaint the king therewith; and if it seem good to the king, the archbishop "having the license of the king shall grant it." Should the archbishop refuse to grant a dispensation, an appeal would lie to the king, who was empowered to *command* the archbishop, under whatever penalty the king might choose, to be expressed in the royal writ of injunction, to grant the required dispensation. Should the archbishop persevere in his refusal, then the king might issue a commission under the great seal, by which he would empower "*such* two spiritual prelates, or persons to be named by himself," as will do and grant the dispensation.

The statute of 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, enacts "that all spiritual prelates, pastors, ministers and curates, within this realm, (England) and dominions of the same, shall and may use, minister, execute and do, or cause to be used, ministered, executed and done, all sacraments, sacramentals, divine services, and all other things within the said realm and dominions, unto all the subjects of the same, as Catholic and Christian men owen to do;" and this, in defiance of whatever sentence of excommunication might issue from the Holy See. By the statute of 26 Henry VIII., c. 1, it is enacted, that the king shall be taken, accepted and reputed the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*, and shall have and enjoy, annexed and *united to the imperial crown of this realm*, as well the title and style thereof, as all honours, dignities, pre-eminences, jurisdictions,

privileges, authorities, immunities, profits and commodities, to the said dignity of the supreme head of the same church belonging and appertaining." The statute proceeds to say, "That our said sovereign lord, his heirs and successors, kings of this realm, shall have full power and authority, from time to time, to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, *heresies*, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities, whatsoever they be, which by any manner, spiritual authority or jurisdiction, ought or may be lawfully reformed, repressed, ordered, redressed, corrected, restrained or amended, most to the pleasure of Almighty God," etc.

The statute of 28 Henry VIII., c. 16, anticipated the principle of the famous act of 8 Elizabeth, regarding ordinations. It enacted, that "all archbishops and bishops of this or of any of the king's dominions, consecrated, and at this present time taken and reputed for archbishops and bishops, may, *by authority of this present parliament*, and not by virtue of any provision or other foreign authority, license, faculty, or dispensation, keep, enjoy and retain their archbishoprics and bishoprics in as large and ample manner *as if they had been promoted, elected, confirmed, and consecrated according to the due course of the law in this realm.* And that every archbishop and bishop of this realm, and of others the king's dominions, may minister, use, and exercise all and every thing and things pertaining to the office or order of an archbishop and bishop, with all tokens, insigns, and ceremonies thereunto lawfully belonging."

On every Sunday and other high feasts throughout the year, were the degraded clergy of England obliged to publish to their flocks, that the king's title of Supreme head or governor on earth, immediately under God, of the Church of England, "appertained only to the king's crown and dignity royal."* The Convocation of Canterbury, on 9th Dec. 1534, calls him "the Supreme head under God of the Anglican Church."†

The power assumed by the king, was by him delegated to Cromwell, a layman, whom he made his vicar general, or "vicegerent, for good and due ministration of justice, to be had in all causes and cases touching the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and for the godly reformation and redress of all errors, heresies, and

* Wilkins, III., 772, 773. † Id. III., 776.

abuses in the Church."—(31 Henry VIII., c. 10.) Hence he "is entrusted with power of visiting all churches, of correcting all manner of persons, archbishops and bishops, of summoning synods, chapters, and convocations, and of presiding therein, of punishing offenders, of excommunicating the disobedient, of accepting resignations, of presiding in elections of prelates, of confirming or annulling elections, and of installing the elected." This power is also allowed to those whom Cromwell himself appointed for his own delegates.*

Previous to ordination or institution to benefices, these extraordinary powers of the king were to be recognized by the candidates, under the solemn sanction of an oath. (35 Henry VIII., c. 1.) Every other person, at the king's pleasure, was liable to be called on to take this oath, and the refusal to take it was made high treason, and punished with death. By the 37 Henry VIII., c. 17, as if to remove the very shadow of any doubt being cast on the legality of the king's title to govern the Church, and to employ whomsoever he willed as his agents in the premises, all canons and constitutions declaring laymen and married persons incapable of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, were abolished; and his majesty was declared to have "*by Holy Scripture* all authority and power to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical," and "full power and authority to correct, punish, and repress all manner of heresies, errors, vices, sins, abuses, idolatries, hypocrisies and superstitions, sprung and growing within the realm of England; and to examine all other manner of jurisdictions, commonly called ecclesiastical jurisdiction." The same statute declares that all archbishops, bishops, and archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons (of the realm), "*have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by and from*" the king.

We have already seen, (chapters II. and VI.,) how Henry exercised these prerogatives in the commissions he gave his bishops. On February 9, 1543, he issued a proclamation, dispensing from the usual observance of Lent, and giving to his subjects "free liberty, faculty, and license to eat all manner of white meats, as milk, eggs, butter, cheese, and such like, during the time of Lent, without any scruple or grudge of conscience, any law, constitution, use or custom to the contrary notwithstanding."†

* Wilkins, III., 784. † Id. III., 867.

If he employed bishops and other ecclesiastical persons in the government of the spiritualty of the body politic, over which he presided, it was, because of his multiplied occupations, he was not able himself personally to discharge them. "But because," said he, "we cannot visit in person each and every part of this our realm, we have called and united with us, *in participation of our solicitude*, others, on whose *vicarious fidelity* we rely, to execute this office as *our ministers*, who may supply our part therein."*

The acts passed in the reign of Edward VI., need not be particularly mentioned, especially as in chapter VI., several examples of the kind of headship claimed by Edward, and recognized in him by the Reformed Church of England in his days, have already been noticed. Mary ascended the throne; and this calumniated queen deserves the praise not only of having restored as much of the plunder of Church property in the two preceding reigns as the Crown continued to hold, but especially of having swept away all vestiges of the sacrilegious usurpations of her father and brother. The first act of Elizabeth was to undo the work of Mary; the jurisdiction of the Holy See was abolished out of the realm of England, and it was enacted, 1 Eliz. c. 1, that "such *jurisdictions*, privileges, superiorities, and pre-eminences, *spiritual and ecclesiastical*, as by any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority hath hitherto been or may lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the ecclesiastical state and persons, and for reformation, order, and correction of the same, and of all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities, shall for ever, by authority of this present parliament, be united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm." The queen is hereby also empowered to appoint commissioners, none of whom need be ecclesiastics, to execute under her these spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdictions. All ecclesiastical persons were required to take oath, "that the queen's highness is the only supreme governor of this realm (England) and of all other her highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal."

A declaration of certain principal articles of religion was put

* Cæterum quia et singula hujus regni nostri loca pro præmissis exequendis nos ipsi personaliter obire non valemus, alios, quorum vicaria fide freti, munus hujus modi veluti per ministros exequamur, qui quum vices nostras in ea parte suppleant, in partem solicitudinis adstitimus et vocamus.—Wilkins, III., 784.

forth by Parker, after his election, or nomination, as the case may have been, with the concurrence of other bishops, and was to be used until articles of faith could be drawn up and enjoined by convocation. These articles were to be read publicly in the church by all "parsons, vicars, and curates at their possession taking, or first entry into their cures, and also, after that, yearly, at two several times, that is to say, the Sunday next following Easter day, and St. Michael the archangel, or on some other Sunday within one month after those feasts. The 5th article ran thus:— "V. Furthermore, I do acknowledge the queen's majesty's prerogative and superiority of government of all estates, and in all causes, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, within this realm, and other her dominions and countries, to be agreeable to God's word, and of right to appertain to her highness, in such sort, as is in the late act of parliament expressed, and sithence (since) by her majesty's injunctions declared and expounded."*

It is very often said, that Elizabeth did not pretend to have the powers in church affairs which her royal father and brother claimed; that she only wished to have the civil governance of the clergy, leaving to them the ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and that the words of the act of the 1 Eliz. c. 1, by which the ecclesiastical supremacy was annexed to the crown, and all the acts of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., annexing such supremacy to the crown, revived,— must be understood, according to the explanation which she herself gave of them, in the following admonition, added to the injunctions issued by her in the first year of her reign; which explanation has been recognized both by the Church and the parliament as the true and proper sense in which the supremacy can be said to belong to the crown.

"*An admonition to simple men deceived by malicious.*

"The queen's majesty being informed, that in certain places of the realm, sundry of her native subjects, being called to ecclesiastical ministry of the Church, be by sinister persuasion and perverse construction induced to find some scruple in the form of an oath, which by an act of the last parliament is prescribed to be required of divers persons, for their recognition of their allegiance to her

* Doc. Annals, pp. 231, 232.

majesty, which certainly never was meant, nor by any equity of words or good sense can be thereof gathered; would that all her loving subjects should understand, that nothing was, is, or shall be meant or intended by the same oath to have any other duty, allegiance, or bond required by the same oath, than was acknowledged to be due to the most noble kings of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth, her majesty's father, or king Edward the Sixth, her majesty's brother.

"And further her majesty forbiddeth all manner her subjects to give ear or credit to such perverse and malicious persons, which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects, how by words of the said oath, it may be collected that the kings or queens of this realm, possessors of the crown, may challenge authority and power of ministry of divine service in the Church; wherein her said subjects be much abused by such evil disposed persons. For certainly her majesty neither doth, nor ever will challenge any authority, than that was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth, and king Edward the Sixth, which is, and was of ancient time due to the imperial crown of this realm; that is, under God, to have the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within these her realms, dominions and countries, of what estate, either ecclesiastical or temporal, soever they be, so as no other foreign power shall or ought to have any superiority over them. And if any person that hath conceived any other sense of the form of the said oath, shall accept the same oath with this interpretation, sense, or meaning; her majesty is well pleased to accept every such in that behalf, as her good and obedient subjects, and shall acquit them of all manner of penalties contained in the said act against such as shall peremptorily or obstinately refuse to take the same oath."*

Dr. Cardwell inserts, in a note on this 'Admonition,' the following observations of Mr. Hallam, which he must be supposed to adopt: "This admonition may be reckoned in the nature of a contemporaneous exposition of a law, as restraining the royal supremacy which was established by the act of 1 Eliz. c. 1, and was asserted in the oath required by it. It was afterwards given in one of the thirty-nine articles, which having been confirmed by

* Doc. Annals, Vol. I., pp. 199–201.

parliament, it is undoubtedly to be reckoned the true sense of the oath. I conceive that it was intended not only to relieve the scruples of Catholics, but of those who had imbibed from the school of Calvin an apprehension of what is sometimes, though rather improperly called Erastianism, the merging of *all* spiritual powers, even those of *ordination and of preaching*, in the paramount authority of the state, towards which the despotism of Henry, and obsequiousness of Cranmer, had seemed to bring the Church of England."*

It appears very clear that the queen disclaims, in this admonition, all pretensions to "challenge authority and power of ministry of divine service," but nothing more. She only claims that authority which was challenged and lately used by the said noble kings of most famous memory, King Henry VIII. and King Edward VI., neither of whom ever claimed "the power of ministry," although Henry is said to have had, at one time, serious thoughts of giving his loving subjects a specimen of his skill in preaching, and had Edward lived, there is no saying what he might not have done in this respect. Elizabeth, however, to remove all apprehensions, which her sex, rather than her station, occasioned, disclaimed all "power of ministry;" but claims all other power, which Henry and Edward challenged, and which she herself challenged and exercised on many occasions, during her long and eventful reign.†

* Hallam; Const. Hist., Vol. I., p. 120, ed. 4to., 1827.—"Selden, de Synedriis, 1, 10, reports that the writings of Erastus were introduced into this country, and published here by those who had the highest place in the ecclesiastical body; from which that most learned lawyer infers that the doctrine of the Anglican Church, in the reign of Elizabeth, was not in favour of any spiritual authority in the bishops."—Lewis, p. 56.

† "Injunctions for the ordering of matters of the Church and religion were framed and set forth, to the number of LIII., called the Queen's Injunctions, by virtue of her supremacy in causes as well ecclesiastical as civil. Who the compiler or compilers were I cannot say assuredly, but I make little doubt they were that select company of divines at Westminster, who had been employed in Sir Thomas Smith's house, in Canon Row, about King Edward's Book, and other Church matters; as Cox, Sandys, Grindal, etc., and most probably Parker among the rest, after his coming up to London. And to this business of the injunctions I am apt to think Cox had respect in that passage of his letter to the divines at Worms, (see Strype, Ann., Vol. I., P. 1, p. 197,) "that they were then breaking down the Popish hedge, and restoring the Lord's vineyard; and that they were then in the work, but the harvest was great and the labourers few." To be sure, in these injunctions, Sir William Cecil, the secretary, had a great hand; who, as his office was, after the copy of them was brought to his hand, reviewed, considered, and worded them according to his discretion; as appeareth by a passage in a letter of Archbishop Parker to him, April 11, 1575: "Whatsoever the (queen's) ecclesiastical preroga-

"The real meaning of these facts," says Mr. Lewis, "is usually evaded by saying that the king does not exercise any ecclesiastical function himself, that is, he neither confers orders, nor preaches, nor ministers the sacraments; and, therefore the spiritual jurisdiction does not really flow from him, whatever the laws of the state may say, and the canons of the church take for granted. If this objection be good as to the spiritual jurisdiction, it is good also as to the civil; the king is the fountain of justice, and the judges have his commission, act in his name, by his authority, and every one knows and believes that the king is the source of the whole civil jurisdiction of the kingdom. Yet for all this the king can decide no question himself; he cannot sit in the lowest of his own courts; the execution of these offices, which he delegates to others, he *must* delegate; he cannot execute them himself, though he be the source of the whole authority by which the administration of the kingdom is carried on. In ecclesiastical matters he acts by his delegates, as he does in civil."*

The best interpretation of the supremacy claimed by Elizabeth are her acts; and these show most unequivocally that she challenged all that her father and brother had ever done, and perhaps more. On June 24, 1559, she issued a commission to certain laymen, with one doctor of divinity, to visit the dioceses of York, Chester and Durham, in the head and members. They were empowered to deprive the bishops, to enforce their orders by ecclesiastical censures and civil penalties,† to license preachers, to restore to their functions such as had been deposed in the former reign; and any two of the commissioners might act with the powers of the whole.‡ "By another statute (1 Eliz. c. 2, § 26,) the sovereign was empowered, with advice of commissioners *or* of the metropolitan, to ordain additional rites or ceremonies to be of equal force and authority with those already ordained by parliament."§

"The statutes of 1 Eliz. c. 1, and 8 Eliz. c. 2, and 39 Eliz. c. 8, being," says Mr. Lewis, "at this day in force and accepted by the English Church, not merely by acquiescence, but directly

tive is, I fear it is not so great as your pen hath given it in the injunctions."—Strype, Ann., Vol. I., p. 235; apud Cardwell.

* Notes, etc., p. 78.

† "The papal authority did never fine or imprison in any case, but *ever* proceeded *only* by ecclesiastical censures."—Lord Coke; Institutes, Part IV., chap. 74.

‡ Wilkins, IV., 193.

§ Cardwell; Doc. Ann., I, pref.

and consciously in a canon still in force, admit of no other interpretation than that the jurisdiction of the Anglican bishops is derived from the crown. The first of these statutes declares all jurisdiction in purely spiritual matters to be 'united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm.' The second pronounces on the validity of the episcopal consecrations, and on the sufficiency of the form of ordination, any statute, law, canon, or other thing to the contrary notwithstanding. The third pronounces valid and lawful the deposition of all the bishops at the beginning of this reign, and that those shall be the lawful occupants whom the queen appointed to the places so made void. These acts do not acknowledge in the clergy any power distinct from that given them by the State. Of these statutes we have no disavowal, nor any clear claim to a divine authority, on the part of the Anglican communion. On the other hand, we have much that is of a kindred character with these laws, and that cannot be reconciled with the notion, that the Anglican Church recognizes in herself any authority but what she derives from the civil power. The articles of religion (Art. 34) describe him who "breaks the traditions and ceremonies of the Church," as one that "hurteth the authority of the *magistrate*;" and in Art. 37, the king is said to have authority to punish for the transgression of the canons. Archbishop Parker, in his metropolitical visitation, inquires if there be any people who maintain that "it is lawful for any man, without outward calling of the *magistrates* appointed, to take upon him any ministry of Christ's Church; or that the word of God doth condemn the regiment (government) of women." (Wilkins IV. 253.) At another time, he inquires whether those who have any "jurisdiction ecclesiastical, have put in execution the queen's majesty's ecclesiastical laws, statutes, injunctions, and all her highness's other commandments published for uniformity of doctrine, and due order of the public ministration of God's Holy Word and sacraments."*

* Wilkins, iv. 259. This servility on the part of the metropolitan and his colleagues, was but badly requited by the imperious woman whom they had agreed to regard as holding the place of the Vicar of Christ. "As a consequence of their creation by the Crown," says Mr. Cooper, "it is as certain as any fact in history, that the queen (Elizabeth) who made the Anglican hierarchy, looked upon them as her state servants; and that whenever the Commons, for instance, sought to interfere in their regulation, she resented the attempt, as men resent interference in the management of their household servants, telling the House that it was her prerogative to see that her bishops minded their business: "and if you do not look to it,"

The first canon passed in the Convocation of 1603 declares, "As our duty to the king's most excellent majesty requireth, we first decree and ordain that the Archbishop of Canterbury, from time to time, all bishops of this province, ——— shall faithfully keep and

she would add, turning to their lordships, "I mind to depose you."—See D'Ewes' Journal, 328, who calls this a 'pious' speech. She suspended Fletcher, Bishop of London, merely for marrying "a fine lady and a widow."—Strype's Whitgift. Collier says: "If this queen's usage of the clergy was compared with what they met with in the reign of Henry VIII., it is to be feared it might be said, her little finger was thicker than her father's loins, and that he disciplined them with whips, but she chastised them with scorpions." II., 669, 670. How thoroughly Elilzabeth despised her bishops is seen from her conduct towards them, when she was near death. "The council sent to her the Bishop of Canterbury, and other of the prelates, upon sight of whom she was much offended, cholerickly rating them, bidding them be packing, saying she was no atheist, but knew full well that they were hedge-priests, and took it for an indignity that they should speak to her." Lady Southwell's narrative, apud Dodd, iii. p. 73. It does not appear that the queen underrated her bishops. Mr. Hallam says: "The bishops of this reign (Elizabeth's) do not appear, with some distinguished exceptions, to have reflected so much honour on the established Church, as those who attach a superstitious reverence to the age of the Reformation are apt to conceive. In the plunder that went forward they took good care of themselves; charges against them of simony, corruption, covetousness, and especially destruction of their church estates, for the benefit of their families, are very common; sometimes, no doubt, unjust, but too frequent to be absolutely without foundation."—Const. Hist. v. 1, p. 120. "The violence of Aylmer's (Bishop of London) temper was not redeemed by many virtues: it is impossible to exonerate his character from the imputations of covetousness, and of plundering the revenues of his see; faults very prevalent among the bishops of that period."—Ib. v. 1, p. 274. When he (Aylmer) grew old, he literally proposed to sell his bishopric to Bancroft, who, however, had patience, and succeeded him at his death. Aylmer's delapidations of the episcopal possessions were such that his successor had £4000 awarded to him for damages, but Aylmer had laid out all his money in real estate, which Bancroft sought to have sold by authority of parliament; but failed in the attempt. In 1572, Cecil, Lord Burghley, drew up a paper for the convocation, headed: "Things needful to be considered, how to be ordered." Among the ecclesiastical "abuses" to be reformed is the following: "The *whole* clergy would be restrained from alienation of their lands, and from unreasonable leases, wastes of wood and grants of reversions and advowsons to any persons, and namely to their wives and children, or to others, for their use. An inquisition would be made in the register books what nombre of grants have been made within these five or six years, to the disherison of the Church: and a resumption would be made thereof by parliament." Another memorial runs in these terms: "The bishops and clergy to be reformed for their wastes of their patrimonies, the negligence and abuse of pluralities, and non-residence by unnecessary dispensations." (Strype. Parker, II. 205, Oxford.) In a circular addressed to the bishops by the council in the following year, it is stated that religion "be now as is commonly said (the more is the pity) only used of you and your officers to get money, or for some other purpose." (Doc. Ann. 1, 352.) "The most amusing part of the story," says Mr. Cooper, to whom I am indebted for the extracts just given, "is that Cecil who thus rebuked their lordships (the bishops), was himself a large dealer in the plunder of the Church. 'During the vacancy,' says Heylin, 138, 'of the see of Peterborough, and in the time of Scambler's incumbency, Sir William Cecil, principal Secretary of State, possessed himself of the best manors in the Soake, which belonged unto it: *and for his* (*Scambler's*) *readiness to confirm the same to him*, preferred him to the see of Norwich

observe, and, as much as in them lieth, shall cause to be observed and kept of others, all and singular laws and statutes made for restoring to the crown of this kingdom the ancient jurisdiction over the state ecclesiastical, and of abolishing all foreign power repugnant to the same." All ecclesiastical persons having care of souls are to preach, four times a year, "that the king's power within his realms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and all other his dominions and countries, is the highest power under God, to whom all men, as well inhabitants as born within the same, do by God's law owe most loyalty and obedience afore and above all other powers and potentates in earth."*

Canon 2, pronounces him excommunicated *ipso facto*, who

in 1584.'" During the vacancy of the see of Ely, which Elizabeth kept vacant during eighteen years, the Lord Keeper Puckering applied to her, on behalf of this Scambler, then bishop of Norwich, and eighty-eight years old, and notorious for his simony. The motive of the Lord Keeper's zeal was his wish to get an advantageous lease of part of the diocesan lands. Hatton, the Lord Keeper, encroached on the bishop of Ely's garden, against which the latter remonstrated, whereupon the queen indites an epistle, yet preserved, it is said, in the register of Ely: it is certainly one of the most curious monuments of that or of any other age:

"Proud Prelate,

You know what you were before I made you what you are. If you do not immediately comply with my request, by G—, I will unfrock you. ELIZABETH."

Mr. Waterworth refers, for proof of the complete and base slavery of the bishops, to Harrington's state of the Church, in *Nugæ Antiquæ*, 1, p. 170, 217, 250. For the persecuting character of these prelates, especially of Parker and Sandys, see the sixth of Cooper's Lectures. The general state of morals in this unhappy reign is thus described by an unexceptionable witness. "The churchmen heaped up many benefices upon themselves, and resided upon none; neglecting their cures; many of them alienated their lands, made unreasonable leases, and wastes of their woods: granted reversions and advowsons to their wives and children, or to others for their use. Churches ran greatly into dilapidations and decays, and were kept nasty and filthy and indecent for God's worship. Among the laity there was little devotion. The Lord's day greatly profaned, and little observed. The common prayers not frequented. Some lived without any service of God at all. Many were mere heathens and atheists. The queen's own court an harbour for epicures and atheists, and a kind of lawless place, because it stood in no parish."—Strype's Life of Parker, p. 395.

* "Seeing, then, that men are by this canon bound to obey the king, 'afore and above all other powers and potentates in earth,' it follows that we must disobey the Church rather than the King, if these authorities do not agree. Unless the power of the Church be merely human, or the king's divine, the unavoidable conclusion is, that man is to be obeyed rather than God."—Lewis; notes, p. 49. The *Reformatio legum*, which wanted only the royal assent to become law to the English Church, says—Rex tam in archiepiscopos, episcopos, clericos et alios ministros quam in laicos infra sua regna et dominia plenissimam jurisdictionem tam civilem quam ecclesiasticam, habet et exercere potest: cum omnis jurisdictio, et ecclesiastica et secularis ab eo tanquam ex uno et eodem fonte derivantur.—(Tit. *De officio et Jurisdictione.*)

"shall affirm that the king's majesty hath not the same authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had among the Jews and Christian emperors of the primitive church; or impeach any part of his regal supremacy in the said causes restored to the crown, and by the laws of this realm therein established."*

Canon 3, pronounces the same penalty upon "whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the Church of England, by law established, *under* the king's majesty, is not a true and apostolical Church, teaching and maintaining the doctrine of the apostles."

Canon 4, pronounces the same penalty upon "whosoever shall hereafter affirm that the government of the Church of England, *under his majesty*, by archbishops, bishops, deans, archdeacons, and the rest that bear office in the same, is antichristian or repugnant to the word of God."

"The present Church of England, using the canons of 1603," remarks Mr. Lewis, "adopts the doctrine of the statute of 8 Eliz.,

* "The kings of the Jews and their authority, were types; their power extended over the priests, whom they could control and direct in their office, though they could not themselves burn incense, or enter into the holy place. David ordered the priests in their courses; Solomon consecrated the temple and deposed Abiathar. The kingdom of Judah was a figure of the kingdom of heaven, which is the Catholic Church; the kings, the prophets, and the priests of that kingdom, were types of our blessed Lord; who, uniting in His own person the royal jurisdiction, with the function of the priest, fulfilled the whole law; and founding His evangelical kingdom, committed its government, not to kings, not to Cæsar or to Herod, but to the Galilean fisherman; to him and his successors He gave that authority which all the faithful are bound to obey. Kings, as such, can have no authority in the spiritual kingdom. The evangelical religion brings with it no worldly advantages, its special mark being the cross of Christ; baptism, therefore, does not give any power to kings, which it does not give equally to all their subjects, and Christian kings can have no more power than heathens in the church, in virtue of their kingly character. To claim a spiritual or ecclesiastical character for kings, because the kings of the Jews had it, is as much against the evangelical law, as it would be for the priesthood to found its authority on the prerogatives of the tribe of Levi. Kings do not succeed to the power or authority of the kings of Judah; that was a divine kingdom. He who made it has destroyed it, and in its place is the Church. If the kings of Judah controlled the priesthood, it follows not that the kings of England can control the priests now. Is it a reasonable thing that the spiritual jurisdiction,—a supernatural gift,—can belong to an earthly crown? can be 'annexed' to the imperial crown of the realm? which is, to the king or queen for the time being, without reference to their religious habits or opinion. Some have held that the Pope may be deposed for personal heresy; may the King of England be deposed? or has he a special prerogative against all acts by which his spiritual jurisdiction may be liable to be taken from him? This supremacy was wielded by James II., who was a Catholic; by William III., who was a Calvinist, in whose reign it was first made law that only a protestant should be king of England; that if a king of England be reconciled to the Church of Rome, his subjects are absolved from their allegiance, and the crown descends to the next protestant heir as if the king 'were naturally dead.'—1 Will. & Mar., c. 2;" Lewis, notes, pp. 66–68.

c. 1, and her divines, therefore, may not throw it aside, as if it were a tyrannical extravagance of the civil power, instead of being, what it really is, the Anglican theory of the hierarchy."

The first of the canons of the Convocation in 1640, passed under the direction of Archbishop Laud, concerns the regal power. It begins, like the canon of 1603, by adopting the acts of parliament relative to the subject, and recites that "the most high and sacred order of kings is of divine right, being the ordinance of God himself. A supreme power is given to this most excellent order by God himself in the Scriptures, which is, that kings should rule and command in their several dominions, all persons of what rank or estate soever, *whether ecclesiastical or civil*. The care of God's Church is so committed to kings in Scripture, that they are commended when the Church keeps the right way, and taxed when it runs amiss, *and therefore her government belongs in chief unto kings*.

"The power to call and dissolve councils, both national and provincial, is the true right of all Christian kings within their own realms and territories; and when, in the first times, prelates used this power, it was, therefore, only because in those days *they had no Christian kings*.

"For any person or persons to set up, maintain, or avow, in any their said realms or territories respectively, under any pretence whatsoever, any independent co-active power, *either Papal or popular*, whether directly or indirectly, is to undermine their great royal office, and cunningly to overthrow that most sacred ordinance which God himself hath established, and is so treasonable against God as well as against the king."

"The penalty," says Mr. Lewis, "for impeaching these wonderful positions, was excommunication by the king's commissioners, suspension for two years from profits of benefices, etc."* "The civil power abolished the Papal jurisdiction, and established the royal supremacy in its place: the Anglican Church adopted the work of the state, binding itself to it by oath, at the most solemn time, in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. Twice it approved deliberately of the acts of Elizabeth, and at this day, in the 36th article of her religion, acknowledges the legislation of Henry and Edward not to be 'superstitious and ungodly.' That

* Notes, 61.

article approves of the oath taken at ordinations in the reign of Edward VI. and his father, which formed an essential part of the ceremonial."* The oath contained the following clause:

"I from henceforth shall utterly renounce, refuse, relinquish, and forsake the Bishop of Rome, and his authority, power, and jurisdiction; and I from henceforth will accept, repute, and take the king's majesty to *be the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England;* I will observe, keep, maintain, and defend the whole effects and contents *of all and singular acts and statutes made and to be made* within this realm in derogation, extirpation, and extinguishment of the Bishop of Rome and his authority, and *all other acts and statutes made or to be made in confirmation or corroboration of the king's power of the supreme head in earth of the Church of England.*"

In the reign of Elizabeth, it was thus worded:

"And to my power shall assist and defend all jurisdictions, privileges, pre-eminences and authorities granted or belonging to the king's highness, his heirs and successors, or united and annexed to the imperial crown of this realm."†

Queen Elizabeth suspended Archbishop Grindal from the exercise of his jurisdiction; and he remained during eight years, in this humiliating state. Instead of repelling indignantly this outrage on their order, the bishops suppliantly besought her majesty to release the archbishop from the censure; and in their address to her on the occasion, they call her 'a goddess,' style her 'most holy,' and even declare her 'a virgin.'‡

Shortly after his promotion to the archiepiscopal dignity, Bancroft had the twelve judges summoned into the Star Chamber, to

* Lewis, pp. 95. † Ib. p. 88.

‡ Cooper, p. 67.—"Grindal had the firmness to maintain his integrity for eight years, during which his suspension continued, and his archiepiscopal functions were generally performed by a commission; but at length he yielded so far as to suppress the exercises within his own jurisdiction, though he would not issue instructions to that effect to the bishops."—Hetherington, p. 45. "But the queen," says Strype, "had formed her resolution, from which she could not be moved by the most respectful and elaborate arguments, the most urgent and humble entreaties of the afflicted archbishop, (Grindal.) She declared herself offended at the number of preachers, and also at the exercises, and warned him to redress both, urging that it was good for the Church to have few preachers, and that three or four might suffice for a county; and that the reading of the homilies to the people was enough." —Life of Grindal, p. 221. Mr. Cooper says—"The above was not the sole, nor, if we are to believe the queen's godson, Harrington, the principal cause of Grindal's disgrace. He *would* prosecute a fellow with two wives, one of them another man's, though her majesty, persuaded by her favourite Leicester, wished to protect him."

give their decision, That his majesty had power by the canon law of the realm, before and independent of any statute, to make, without parliament, orders and constitutions of the clergy, and to deprive them if they obeyed not; and, further, to declare that if they petitioned in any numbers for the redress of any grievance that might arise out of this extravagant exercise of the prerogative, they should be guilty of an offence finable at discretion, and very near to treason and felony in the punishment; "thus making," says Warner, "the king absolute in all ecclesiastical affairs, without any limitation, or redress; and paving the way for his being so in affairs of state."*

Queen Elizabeth exercised her sovereign jurisdiction by suspending Fletcher, Bishop of London. Her successor, James I., removed the disability to perform ecclesiastical functions which the canon law imposes on those ecclesiastics who become guilty of homicide. Abbot, the primate, while shooting, had the misfortune to kill Peter Hawkins. Although the event was purely accidental, it was judged to have rendered Abbot irregular; and he continued to labour under this canonical disability until restored by James, to the exercise of his archiepiscopal functions.† It was the fate of Abbot, who had been restored by one monarch, to be suspended by another. Charles I. put the See of Canterbury in commission, that is, appointed commissioners to govern it in his name. He ratified anew the Thirty-nine Articles, and commanded them to be understood in a particular sense, against which the house of commons protested. He gives himself the title of "Supreme governor of the Church," in the declaration issued on this occasion, and threatens those who should offend against the declaration, with being "liable to our displeasure and the Church's censure, in our commission ecclesiastial as well as any other." Addressing the archbishop in a letter he says: "they to whom we have committed the government of the Church under us."‡ In 1633 he gave instructions to the primate for the general government of his province, the last clause of which is as follows:—

"We command every bishop respectively to give his account in writing to his metropolitan of all these our instructions, or as many of them as may concern him, at or before the tenth day of December, yearly; and likewise that you, out of them, make a

* Neal; Puritans, Vol. I., p. 417, and note, apud Cooper.
† Wilkins, IV., 462. ‡ Id. 472.

brief of your whole province, and present it to us yearly, by the second of January following: *that so we may see how the Church is governed, and our commands obeyed*, and hereof in any wise fail you not."* This monarch, who was so solicitous to know how those to whom he had committed the government of the Church demeaned themselves, was willing at one time to establish presbyterianism and suspend episcopacy for three years, to allow of no ordinations in the interval, and to leave the final settlement regarding the bishops to such an arrangement as he and his puritan parliament might make in the matter.†

With due consideration for the variety of opinions which prevailed among his subjects, Charles II., in his declaration of 25th October, 1660, allowed the sign of the cross to be used or discontinued in baptism, according to the discretion of parents; he dispensed with subscription to the three articles of Canon 36, and the oath of canonical obedience at ordinations of candidates who scrupled them, on condition, however, of their taking the oath of allegiance and supremacy.‡ He forbade preachers to determine any thing "positively and doctrinally," concerning "deep points of election and reprobation."§ Whatever of religious principle this supreme governor of the Church of England on earth had, was Catholic, as might have been concluded from his early history. His reception of the sacraments at the hands of a Catholic priest, Father Huddlestone, at the hour of death, renders this almost certain.

James II., was an avowed Catholic, and had he been less honest than he was in the expression of his principles, nothing forbids the idea that he might have governed the spirituality of his realm with as much success as his brother. He was succeeded by William III., a Dutch Calvinist, who, in imitation of Elizabeth, deprived of their sees several bishops, who were honest enough to maintain their principles, at the sacrifice of their places. He issued his injunction to the archbishops, and through them to their suffragans, in which he very correctly calls them "our bishops."‖ He also gave "directions to our archbishops and bishops for the preserving of unity in the church and the purity of the christian faith concerning the Holy Trinity."¶ On

* Wilkins, IV., 481. † Collier, II., 857. ‡ Wilkins, IV., 577.
§ Id. 606. ‖ Id. 624. ¶ Id. 625.

the 8th of April, 1707, that undutiful child, Queen Anne, wrote to the primate:—

"In our letter to you, bearing date, February 25, 1705, which we directed to be communicated to the bishops and clergy of the convocation of your province, we declared our resolution to maintain our supremacy, and the due subordination of presbyters to bishops, as fundamental parts of the constitution of the Church of England." Never did royal lady observe more faithfully her promise, as her conduct in the affair of Whiston, about which further on, clearly shows.

On 11th December, 1714, George I. issued directions "to our archbishops and bishops, for the preserving of unity in the church, the purity of the christian faith concerning the Holy Trinity, and also for preserving the peace and quiet of the state." In them, he says, "that there have of late been great differences among some of the clergy of this our realm about their ways of expressing themselves in their sermons and writings, concerning the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity; and whereas, also, unusual liberties have been taken by several of the said clergy, in intermeddling with the affairs of state and government, and the constitutions of the realm; we, therefore, out of our princely zeal, have thought fit to send you these following directions, which we straitly charge and command you that you publish, and see that they be observed within your several dioceses." Among these directions the one which has reference to the present subject, is a command not "to omit or leave out our titles by the said canon, (55th) required to be declared and recognized." In the following year, he gave convocation permission to treat of certain specific points, which he assigned to them.* During his reign, the convocation of Canterbury ceased to deliberate; that of York appears to have done so as early as 1698.† "It is now called," says Burke, "for form only. It sits for the purpose of passing some polite ecclesiastical compliments to the king, and when that grace is said, retires, and is heard of no more. It is, however, *a part of the constitution*, and may be called into act and energy, whenever there is occasion, and whenever those who conjure up that spirit will choose to abide the consequence." In the words of the satirist, observes Mr. Cooper:

"Poor convocation gapes: alas! it cannot speak."

* Wilkins, IV., 666, 667. † Ib. 625.

"Whatever has been done, for or by the Church of England, since that time," says Mr. Lewis, "has been done in parliament. That assembly does not recognize in the clergy any authority, which is not derived from and controlled by the civil power. From the days of Queen Elizabeth it has used one uniform language, and its conduct has been throughout consistent. Neither can we trace any difference in that conduct when the members of both its houses were members of the established religion, from what it is now, when its members may be of any religion or of none."*

In the reign of George III., a bishop was sent to India. In the act of parliament passed on the occasion—for this Church, true to the instinct of its origin, looks up to parliament for every faculty it possesses, every privilege it can acquire,—it is said: "Provided always, and be it enacted that such bishop *shall not have or* use any *jurisdiction* or exercise any *episcopal function whatsoever*, either in the East Indies or elsewhere, but only such *jurisdiction and functions* as shall or may from time to time be limited to him by his majesty by letters patent under the great seal of the United Kingdom."†

"By this act," observes Mr. Lewis, "if confirmation (of children) or consecration had been omitted in the letters patent referred to in the act, the bishop would not have the power of conferring them." "The reign of William IV.," he continues, "is remarkable for the actual disappearance of the shadow of episcopal authority. The whole Anglican Church was subjected to a commission. Bishops have no more power in this commission than the laymen who were made their colleagues. This commission has been made perpetual by statute, and the jurisdiction of the Anglican prelates has been changed, extended and lessened, by the authority of parliament. The bishops either advise these changes or accept them. Parliament gives them their autho-

* Notes, p. 41.—"By the constitution of the Church of England, it is that the supreme legislative power of the Church is in king, lords and commons in parliament. Parliament, as the supreme legislature of the Church, has the same extent of true power in the Church of England, as any church legislature ever had, and may therefore censure, excommunicate, depose, degrade, etc.; or may give authoritative directions to the officers of the church to perform any of them; and may also make laws and canons to bind the whole church, as they shall judge proper, not repugnant to the law of God or nature."—Speaker Onslow's note to Burnet's Own Times, Vol. IV., p. 17, last edition; apud Cooper.

† 53 Geo. III., c. 155, s. 53.

rity and force, compelling the bishops to incur the guilt of simony, as, for instance,—

"'And be it enacted, that, from and after the passing of this act, the Bishop of Ely for the time being shall take and hold the said bishopric, and all the property, patronage and rights belonging thereto, except as hereinbefore provided, *subject to or under any provisions* which shall be made by or under authority of parliament, with respect to the said bishopric within the space of three years next after the passing of this act; any law, statute, or canon, to the contrary notwithstanding." (6 & 7 Will. IV., c. 87, s. 21.)

"In the present reign we have a clear recognition, that the jurisdiction of the bishops is from the crown, in the statute 6 & 7 Vict., c. 62, where it is provided, that if a bishop become incapable of performing his functions, after certain proceedings—instituted by the lord chancellor in the case of an archbishop, 'it shall be lawful for her majesty by letters patent under the great seal—to appoint one of the bishops of the same province—to exercise all the functions and powers, as well with regard to the temporalities as spiritualities of the bishop or archbishop so found to have become incapable.'

"These facts are commonly dealt with, as if they had no meaning, or as indications of tyranny over the Church on the part of the state; and it is, therefore, insinuated that churchmen need not regard them; that they are not binding in conscience, but only submitted to till such time as they can be got rid of, for she herself is no way committed to them. Passing by for the present the dishonesty of this answer, it will be better to ascertain whether it be a true answer in itself.

"The clergy in convocation acknowledged the king to be the supreme head of the Church of England, which is, perhaps, at this day, a part of the royal titles, as it was of Henry VIII. and Edward VI.; certainly it is not formally disowned, the acts of parliament and of consecration that acknowledged it, being unrepealed."*

* Notes, pp. 42–44.—In all this the crown has not stepped beyond the power which Hooker recognizes in it. "Our laws," says he, "have provided that the king's (or queen's) supereminent authority and power shall serve; as, namely, when the whole ecclesiastical state, or the principal persons therein, do need visitation and reformation; when, in any part of the Church, errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, enormities, are grown, which men in their several jurisdictions do not or cannot help; whatsoever any spiritual authority or power, (such as legates from) the court of Rome did sometimes exercise for the remedy of those evils in lawful sort, (that is, without violation of the law of God or nature in the

"The Anglican Church recognizes in the king her supreme head in earth; all her ministers are subjected in a spiritual relation to a layman, whose claim to rule them is founded on his possession of the throne; by a law of the kingdom he must be a protestant: he, a protestant king, has jurisdiction in causes of heresy: in the greatest and the least questions by which the peace of the Church is disturbed, the final sentence is from the king's court. It was but the other day that the validity of lay baptism was affirmed by a lay tribunal; and a bishop protested against the sentence, denying the doctrine of the universal church. These powers of the English crown are not vested in it only by acts of parliament, the canons of the Anglican Church allow it, so that she is as much bound to the observance of their laws, and that by her own deliberate deed, as is the Catholic Church to the decrees of the Council of Trent."*

Like all usurpations, which increase their pretensions in proportion as they acquire stability and strength, the crown of England has practically asserted its power to give ecclesiastical jurisdiction beyond the limits of the realm. "That limitation," says Mr. Lewis, "has been broken in upon in the factories abroad, and recently by a special act of Parliament, 5 Vict. c. 6. By this act, the two primates are enabled to ordain foreigners to exercise jurisdiction in countries whereof they are not subjects. Bishops so consecrated may exercise, within such limits as may 'from time to time be assigned for that purpose by her majesty, such *spiritual jurisdiction* over the ministers of British congregations of the United Churches of England and Ireland, and over such *other Protestant congregations* as may be desirous of placing themselves under his or their authority.' Accordingly, the warrant for the consecration recites in one instance, 'that Syria, Chaldea, Egypt, and Abyssinia' were to be the limits of the spiritual juris-

deed done,) as much in every degree our laws have fully granted that the king for ever may do, not only by setting ecclesiastical synods on work, that the thing may be their act, and the king their motion unto it, but by commissioners few or many, who having the king's letters patent, may, in the virtue thereof, execute the premises as agents in the right, not of their own peculiar and ordinary, but of his supereminent power."—Hooker; apud Cooper.

* Notes, p. 79.—Elsewhere he says: "The succession of bishops is made to rest upon the succession to the English throne; this is not merely an abstract proposition, but was practically enforced at the revolution, (1688,) when a new king began a new succession of bishops, who were thrust into sees then full; through those intruding bishops the Anglican succession is continued."—P. 74.

diction of one so consecrated, 'subject, nevertheless, to such alterations' as her majesty 'from time to time' might make."* Of the hierarchy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, the writer elsewhere observes:

"The bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States derive their jurisdiction from no higher source than the 'imperial crown of this realm' (England.) They occupy a position even less defensible, if possible, than their Anglican ordainers, for they entered America with orders conferred upon them by the civil power, and that the power of a country scarcely at peace with their own. Could the English bishops commit any authority to the Americans whom they ordained over the subjects (citizens) of the United States? If they could, what is the limit of the Anglican jurisdiction? If not, what is the jurisdiction of the American bishops, and what are the obligations to obey them? It is useless to maintain their cause by saying, that consecration confers jurisdiction, which it never did. A bishop, by consecration, is not invested with jurisdiction, any more than a priest, at his ordination, with the cure of souls. They become qualified to use these powers respectively, but do not obtain them. A bishop may be without jurisdiction, and a priest have jurisdiction over him. Such things are to be found even now in the Reformed Anglican Church, and are no violation of the ecclesiastical law."†

"Even if the present state of the Anglican church," says he again, "were the result of secular legislation, to which she had not originally consented, a most grave accusation would still lie against her; that she has for three hundred years allowed all persons to contradict her supposed authority, and submitted to most injurious treatment, without protesting against the royal supremacy or vindicating the inherent dignity of her office. She has even lent her secret and most dread tribunal, (Canon 113, A. D. 1603,) towards the furthering of civil ends; she has been content to appear as the instrument of an earthly policy, and the servant of the secular power; nor has she been inconsistent, for the most solemn and gorgeous ceremonial in which her prelates minister is the coronation of her supreme head."‡

* Notes, p. 76. † P. 70.

‡ Lewis, p. 64.—"We do not any way bind the said minister by this our constitution, (to present offenders to the bishop,) but do straitly charge and admonish him, that he do not, at any time, reveal and make known to any person whatsoever, any crime or offence, so committed to his trust and secrecy, (in confession,)

An attentive examination of this important point is especially necessary for those otherwise respectable individuals in this country, who seem to know every thing but the nature of their ecclesiastical descent; who by the energetic repetition of the assumptions on which they have based their system, seem to imagine that they can bend the stubborn facts of history to their own favourite fancies; and who, making apparently no account of the possibility of common sense and ordinary information being qualities of those whom they address, appear to hope that they can enlarge the sphere of that illusion in which they themselves live. There are few of those who will permit themselves to reason on the facts I have spread before them, unless they labour under a more than ordinary theological hallucination, but will be prepared to say, with a late minister of the establishment, Dr. Arnold:—"With a ministry such as that of the Church of England, the notion of apostolical succession is absurd. Our clergy are neither priests nor governors. And if there be no divinely appointed succession for our kings and parliaments, who are the only supreme governors of the church, it is impossible to suppose that such a succession can exist in the case of the clergy, who are subordinate ministers with no independent power in the church whatsoever."*

I now come to establish the second proposition; namely, that the Church of England is bound to teach what the state may prescribe and nothing else; and that it cannot enact any canon which may bind the laity, or even enforce, by canonical penalties, such as regards the clergy or the laity, without the concurrence of the state. The proof of this will be supplied by public and undeniable facts, taken from the history of that church; and which, like those adduced in the preceding part of this chapter, are the legitimate developments of that supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, which that church recognizes in the crown.

The thirty-nine articles, in 1563, were subscribed under the following conditions: "Ista subscriptio facta est ab *omnibus* sub hac protestatione: quod nihil statuunt in præjudicium cujus-

except they be such crimes as by the laws of this realm his own life may be called into question for concealing the same, under pain of irregularity."—Canon, 113, A. D. 1603. The 67th Canon of the same year obliged ministers or curates to visit the sick of the parish, *if the disease be not known, or probably suspected to be infectious.*

* Sermons, III., Appendix, p. 436; apud Cooper, p. 240.

cunque senatus-consulti, sed tantum supplicem libellum, petitiones suas continentem, humiliter offerunt." ("*All* have subscribed, with the protestation, that *they determine nothing to the prejudice of any act of parliament*, but only humbly offer a petition containing their wishes.") "From which it appears," says Mr. Lewis, "that convocation did not pretend to give any authority to the result of their own deliberations, even in matters of faith, but received it from the state."*

It is owing to a change of mind in Queen Elizabeth, arising rather from motives of political expediency than any thing else, that the Church of England has not retained the crucifix in its temples. Her own sentiments on this subject are well known; and the casuists of the party had to examine how far it might be lawful to comply with her orders. "When one of her chaplains, M. Alexander Nowell, dean of St. Paul's, had spoken less reverently in a sermon before her, of the sign of the cross, she called aloud to him, from her closet window, commanding him to retire from that ungodly digression, and return to his text;"† and in reference to the controversy which arose on this subject, in the early part of her reign, she gave her bishops to understand that they would have to comply with her desires, or to give up their sees.‡ On the 9th August, 1561, she issued an injunction for the better government of cathedrals, the object of which was to banish from the houses of the clergy attached to them, their wives, children and nurses, "whereof," says she, "no small offence groweth to the entent of the founders, and to the quiet and orderly profession of studie

* P. 48. † Heylin's Hist. Ref., p. 124.

‡ Dr. Cardwell says: "She (the queen,) was known still to be favourable to the use of crosses and crucifixes, and they continued to be exhibited not merely in her own chapel, but also in many of the churches. Bishop Cox, in writing to Peter Martyr, in Aug., 1559, says: "excepto quod crucis crucifixique imaginem in templis tolerare *cogantur*, omnia religionis capita, quæ Edwardi tempore, tenent."—Hess. Cat., Vol. II., p. 122. Sampson to the same, in the following January, asks: "si princeps ita *injungat* omnibus episcopis et pastoribus ut vel admittant in suas ecclesias imaginem cum candelis, vel ministerio verbi cedant, quid hic faciendum sit?"—Hess. Cat., Vol. II., p. 131; Burnet, H. R., Vol. III., P. 2, p. 397. And Bishop Jewel, in Feb., 1560, says to the same: "Nunc ardet lis illa crucularia. Eo enim jam res pervenit ut aut cruces argenteæ, et stanneæ, quas nos ubique confregimus, restituendæ sunt, aut *episcopatus relinquendi*."—Hess. Cat., Vol. II., p. 133; Burnet, H. R., Vol. III., P. 3, p. 350. It appears from the same letter that a disputation was to be held on the subject, and that Parker and Cox had undertaken to defend the use of crosses against Grindal and Jewel, who were most earnest in opposing them."—Doc. Annals, Vol. I, p. 235, note. The extracts from Sampson and Jewel's letters show that the writers believed that perseverance in opposing the queen's wishes would be visited by her with—deprivation!

and learning within the same." She was decidedly opposed to a married clergy, and publicly rebuked her primate for the equivocal character of his household.*

"It was the constant maxim of Queen Elizabeth," says Dr. Cardwell, "derived not so much from the statute of supremacy, (1 Eliz c. 1,) as from the inseparable rights and prerogatives of the crown, that she might establish or repeal canons, and might ordain or abolish any religious rite or ceremony; and that in so

* Documentary Annals, Vol. I., p. 273.—"On the 12th of the same month, (August,) Secretary Cecil writes thus to the archbishop: 'Her majesty continueth very ill affected to the state of matrimony in the clergy. And if I were not therein very stiff, her majesty would utterly and openly condemn and forbid it. In the end, for your satisfaction, this injunction now sent to your grace is devised. The good order thereof shall do no harm. I have devised to send it of this sort to your grace for your province, and to the archbishop of York for his; and to the chancellors of the two universities for their charge; so as it shall not be promulged to be popular.'—Strype, Parker, Vol. I., p. 214. The queen's strong feeling on this subject is shewn in a letter written soon afterwards by the archbishop to the secretary, in the following words: 'I was in a horror to hear such words to come from her mild nature, and christianly learned conscience, as she spake concerning God's holy ordinance and institution of matrimony. I marvailed that our states in that behalf cannot please her highness, which we doubt nothing at all to please God's sacred majesty, and trust to stand before God's judgment seat in a good conscience therewith, for all the glorious shine of counterfeited chastity.'—Strype, Parker, Vol. III., p. 50; Comp. Burn. Eccles. Law, art. Marriage of Priests, Vol. II., p. 453;" Doc. Annals, note. The words which excited Parker's horror, were a rough rebuke she administered to him, in the presence of the Dean of Arches, and others of his officers, for the state in which he and his brother bishops were living, under the pretended veil of marriage; "insomuch," says Parker, "that the queen's highness expressed to us a repentance that we were thus appointed in office, wishing it were otherwise." The marriage of priests was permitted by 2 and 3 Edward VI., c. 21. This was repealed by 1 Mary, c. 5; nor was the act of Mary repealed till the accession of James I. The thirty-second of the thirty-nine Articles, allows of such marriages, and the twenty-ninth of the fifty three "Injunctions," issued by Elizabeth, in 1559, permits them, under conditions, however, which show most plainly her repugnance to the measure, and the degraded character of the clergy to whom she prescribed them. Two justices of the peace were to approve of the person whom a minister wished to marry; a bishop's choice was to be with the concurrence of the metropolitan. Still they were not legal; and in the eye of the canon and municipal law, were immoral. The address which Elizabeth made Archbishop Parker's consort, on receiving sumptuous hospitality at the archiepiscopal palace of Lambeth, is well known. "*Madam*," (the style of a married lady,) said she, "I may not call you; *Mistress*, I am loth to call you; but, however, I thank you for your good cheer." The family name of this lady was Harleston, and in deeds during the archbishop's life, she was usually styled, Parker *alias* Harleston. At her death, her brother was declared her heir at law, although she left children by the archbishop; who were subsequently legitimated by letters procured by Parker. —Life of Parker, p. 511. In the diocese of Bangor, it was usual for the clergy, some years after Elizabeth's accession, to pay the bishop for a license to keep a concubine.—Strype's Parker, p. 203; Hallam's Constit. Hist., 1, 187, note. What a degradation entailed on the whole clergy of a nation, during almost half a century! and what are we to think of those who patiently submitted to it?

doing, she might call in the aid of her council, of a commission of divines, of a convocation, or a parliament, as she judged most expedient. *In the case of the articles, she considered their authority to rest upon her ratification of them, after they had been prepared by the synod of the clergy, for her examination and approval.* This doctrine was adopted by Archbishops Whitgift and Bancroft, and was sanctioned by solemn decisions from the highest legal authorities. It was also asserted by King James I., who declared in his first proclamation, (No. CXVI.) that he would proceed according to the laws and customs of this realm, by advice of his council, or in his high court of parliament, or by convocation of his clergy, as he should find reason to lead him, and afterwards commanded alterations to be made without the authority of parliament. The proper ratification of articles on the part of the crown, seems also from this declaration (of Charles I. prefixed to book of common prayer,) to have been maintained by Charles I. and his advisers; but it may be inferred from the passage in which he declares his supremacy as governor of the church, that he limited his powers more narrowly than his predecessors had done, and that he allowed the necessity of calling in the aid of the clergy in their convocation, not only in deciding points of doctrine, but also in case of difference arising on matters of external policy. This change was doubtless owing to the suggestion of Laud, and to the influence which the church had obtained in the royal counsels."*

In the year 1595 certain articles, known by the name of "the Lambeth articles," were composed by Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury, Fletcher, bishop of London, Vaughan, bishop of Bangor, Tyndall, dean of Ely, and Whitaker, regius professor of Cambridge—the same divine, copious extract from whose writings are given in the third chapter of the present work. These articles teach pure Calvinism. The archbishop of York, Hutton, concurred in judgment with the above named divines, and expressed his concurrence in a letter, appended to the articles in Dr. Cardwell's collection. "The Lambeth articles" owe their origin to a sermon *ad clerum* preached at Cambridge in which Calvinistic views were attacked. The heads of the university appealed, says Cardwell, "to the archbishop against the preacher,

* Doc. Ann., Vol. II., pp. 171, 172.

entreating his grace, at the same time, to prevent any such discussions for the future by requiring exact conformity of doctrine. The nine Lambeth articles were framed in consequence, and were sent down to Cambridge with a strict injunction, that the members of the university should regulate their judgments according to that model. The queen was greatly displeased at the publication of these articles, and seems to have threatened the archbishop with the punishment of a *præmunire*, until she was informed that they were not designed to be taken as canons or decrees of the Church, but merely as articles of peace or private judgment. Nevertheless, although she appeared to be satisfied, *she ordered that they should be recalled and suppressed.* If it appear surprising that the archbishop should have so expressed himself to the displeasure of his royal mistress, we must remember that he only declared, what had for some time been the prevailing belief of the Church, and that the successor to the throne, now not far from the actual occupation of it, had hitherto always declared himself in favour of Calvinistic opinions."*

The question of lay baptism is one deeply interesting to every Christian heart, and concerning which the practice and sentiment of the Catholic Church are unequivocal. In the rubrics and other provisions of the two books of Edward VI., as well as in the editions of the book of Common Prayer, under Elizabeth, was preserved the expression of this ancient belief. If we are to believe an authority, which, on this subject, is entitled to our confidence, it was rather to the motive of expediency than to any attachment to principle, that we are to ascribe the retention of these vestiges of the ancient faith in the reformed ritual. The Reformers were disposed to omit them, but determined to retain them, lest, otherwise, "*perhaps this book would not have passed the parliament.*"† In 1575 the clergy prepared a canon against lay baptism, which was principally intended to abolish the practice of baptism by women, such practice being a clear recognition of the necessity of the sacrament. *Queen Elizabeth drew her pen across the canon*, when it was, among others, submitted to her for her approval; "and accordingly," says Mr. Cooper, "it never appeared in the

* Cardwell; Doc. Ann., Vol. II., p. 33.—The Doctor seems to have well understood the character of the Elizabethan prelates; and not to have had a very high idea of the class of men for whom he himself wrote.

† Barlow's Account of Conf. Hamp. Court.

printed copies of that year; but though its framers lacked the courage to venture into print, they had magnanimity enough to steal forth into manuscript."* At the Hampton Court Conference, in the early part of the following reign, the question of the Church's discipline in this regard was the subject of dispute. The king showed the discordant bishops, that the doctrine of the Church, as laid down in the Common Prayer Book, was in favour of women and private persons baptizing, in case of necessity.

The conference upon this subject lasted three hours: "the king *alone*," says Barlow, "disputing with the bishops, so wisely, wittily, and learnedly, with that pretty patience as I think never man living heard the like. In the end he won this of them, that it should only be administered by ministers, yet in private houses, if occasion required." "There seems," says Mr. Cooper, whose account I abridge, "to have been some lingerings of grace about the unfortunate and fallen creatures, the bishops who assisted at this conference. It was the longest and most strenuous contest they had yet sustained with the royal theologian. They represented to him every consideration which they thought would weigh with him, in order to induce him to forego the alteration in the rubric on which he was so intent. They particularly insisted with Bancroft, 'on the absurdities and impieties of *their* opinion, who think there is no necessity in baptism.' They went further; they took the matter upon the lowest possible ground; assuming, for the moment, that the reasons for the necessity of baptism were not so cogent or so unanswerable as they were represented to be. Yet still, they argued, as it was undeniable that the vast majority of the christian world held, and ever did hold, such necessity, it was not permissible by christian charity, that a soul, redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, should be risked in its chance of salvation, by the withholding of a rite, so long and so universally held to be of the last importance. 'Who is he,' was the strong language of Bancroft, 'that having any religion, would not speedily by any means procure his child to be baptized; and rather ground his action upon Christ's promise, than his omission thereof upon God's secret judgment?'—Bilson of Winchester came to the rescue. 'Speaking very learnedly and earnestly on that point,' says Barlow, 'affirming that the denying of private persons to

* P. 194.

baptize, in the case of necessity, were to cross all antiquity.' But he too, like his brother of London, (Bancroft) preferred 'crossing all antiquity' to crossing the 'pretty patience' of the monarch, who to an observation of his, 'that it was a rule agreed among divines that the minister was not of the essence of the sacrament,' smartly and rather peevishly replied, that though he was not of the essence of the sacrament, he is of the essence of the right and lawful ministry of the sacrament.' This was the convincing argument that silenced all opposition. Though the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament, he is, quoth the king, of the essence of having it done, as I want it, and I am master here. This was the plain reading of the case; and it was enough. They were too courtly to dispute the royal will; and lay baptism has been ever since 'discouraged' (that is the word) in the Church. The bishops, personally, felt themselves every way 'discouraged.' They did not dare to contravene the royal will. Neither did they dare broadly to affirm the principle, that laymen could not baptize validly, or even in case of necessity, lawfully. The truth was too plain and too forcible for them; they had recourse, as usual, to the disreputable subterfuge of shifting out of the difficulty by the use of indistinct and ambiguous language—and doctrine, that from the age of Cyprian was clear as the sun at noon-day, and necessarily so, because connected with the salvation of millions, was darkened and obscured by her professing guardians, in order to humour the conceit of a royal pedant. It is now a matter so effectually perplexed, that the cleverest divines of the Church of England are at variance with each other as to the validity or non validity of lay baptism."*

When the Supreme Governor in earth of the Church of England was a Dutch Calvinist, William III., who, if baptized at all, had been baptized by a layman, the question of lay baptism came again under consideration with more chance of being correctly examined. In 1717, in the following reign, the upper house of convocation, with one exception, the Bishop of Rochester, decided, that lay baptism was valid—a decision, as Mr. Cooper observes, right in the teeth of the unanimous decision of the bishops in 1575; but, as in the latter year, the decision of the bishops was overruled by the Queen, so the decision of 1717 was rejected by the lower

* Pp. 194–197.

house of convocation; not because the presbyters of the Church differed from the bishops as to the doctrine, but, according to the testimony of Archbishop Sharp, because they feared they should, by declaring the truth, give too great encouragement to the dissenters.*

"What the bishops *could* not do, what the presbyters *would* not do," says Mr. Cooper, "Sir Herbert Jenner, the lay president of the Court of Arches, has done for them,—without them,—aye, and in spite of them. He has determined that, be their opinion what it may, it is the law for them, that dissenters' baptism is good and valid baptism; and that, in the virtue of that law, they are compelled to give up their own opinion, and administer to the obnoxious recipient every rite and ministration he may condescend to ask, or may be asked for him in life or in death, at their hands." The decision of the learned judge was formed, as he himself expressly avowed, without any reference to the truth or falsehood of the principle, which he sanctioned by his sentence, but solely from a consideration of the law as it actually stood.—"Whether baptism administered by laymen," said he, "is abstractedly good and valid, according to the intention of the Divine Founder of the sacrament, or not, *is not the question for me.*"†

On appeal to the supreme tribunal for ecclesiastical affairs, the privy council, the judgment of Sir Herbert Jenner was affirmed, and the appellants, the clergy, dismissed with costs. In the elaborate judgment of that court, the scruples which the appellants had put forward, as not permitting them conscientiously to abide by the decision of the Court of Arches, were treated with but little sympathy. They were referred to the numerous cases of *civil and judicial functionaries*, who, finding the duties of their offices incompatible with their religious scruples, quietly and without clamour, or seeking for the honour of martyrdom, retired and left the place for others who felt no such difficulty. "*They*" (these magistrates) observed the lords of the privy council, "*they* did not complain that their conscience was forced; *they* did not retain the emoluments of a station of which their conscience forbade them to discharge the duties; *they* sacrificed their interest to their duties, and gave way to those who could honestly fill the place and honestly hold the office, by performing its appointed func-

* Cooper, p. 201. † Curteis's Reports, p. 275; apud Cooper.

tions." I have not heard of a single bishop resigning his see, or a single rector giving up his cure of souls, as might have been expected from the scruples which they pleaded. As Sir Herbert Jenner declared what the law of the land was, without entering into any inquiry, as to the conformity between that law and the Gospel, the clergy, doubtless, reconcile their consciences to the practical effects of his decisions by the same motive, however that decision may be in opposition with their views.

Another illustration of the same truth, that the doctrine of the church is at the mercy of the state, is found in the celebrated case of Whiston, professor of mathematics in Cambridge, who in the early part of the last century, distinguished himself by the boldness with which he maintained Arian views. Deprived of his post in the university, he published a vindication of his principles and conduct; and, as if to set at defiance the authority of the Church, to which he nominally belonged, he dedicated it to convocation. This was a challenge which that assembly could not dissemble; and accordingly, in 1717, it resolved to censure the obnoxious work if possible. The archbishop drew up a paper, in which he urged on the bishops the necessity of doing something, and, at the same time, showed them the difficulty of doing any thing in the matter. The principal difficulty was occasioned by the act of 1 Eliz. c. 1, by which all jurisdiction respecting heresy was annexed to the crown. "Here," says Burnet, "they were brought to a stand."* "As the case," says Lathbury, "was involved in difficulties, the upper house presented an address to her majesty on the subject, stating the offence alleged against Whiston, namely, that he had advanced certain positions, which were damnable and blasphemous, against the doctrines of the Trinity, expressly contradicting the two fundamental articles of the Nicene creed, and defaming the whole Athanasian. They then express their desire to repress blasphemy, according to the powers granted by her majesty's license; but that certain doubts have arisen respecting their powers. They were especially in doubt whether an appeal would lie from the convocation to the crown."* "In case of appeal," says Burnet, "the question would arise, by what delegates *our* (the bishops) sentence was to be executed? were no bishops to be in the court of delegates?

* Apud Cooper, p. 58.

or was the sentence of the archbishop and his twenty-one suffragan bishops, with the clergy of the province, to be judged by the archbishop of York, and his three suffragan bishops?"

Agreeably to the prayer of this address, the question was referred to the judges, who *all* agreed that an appeal did lie from the bishops to the queen, even in the supposition that they had power in convocation to try heresy: but whether convocation had jurisdiction at all in heresy, was not agreed upon by the judges. Four of them gave a decided opinion, that, since the 25th Henry VIII., convocation had no such power; the remaining eight were of opinion that convocation might judge such cases, but not finally. This latter opinion, although hesitatingly expressed, and with the express reservation on the part of those who gave it, of their entire power to alter it, should any new consideration be suggested to convince them of their mistake, left the sentence of convocation liable to be reversed by any commissioners, ecclesiastics or laymen, as the queen might appoint. The queen, however, authorized convocation to proceed.

Whiston's book was condemned by both houses of convocation, that is, by the entire Church of England, through its representatives. But without the queen's ratification, the sentence was of no avail, and that ratification was meanly, but most determinedly, denied. "The judgment of the convocation," says Mr. Lathbury, "was sent to her majesty, who promised to take it into consideration; but on the 12th of June, the convocation closed, and no answer had been forwarded. When the convocation assembled in the ensuing winter, two bishops were deputed to wait upon the queen, for the purpose of obtaining her assent to the censure; but an excuse was made, that the document could not be found. Other messengers were afterwards sent; but it was said that the queen could not remember to whom she had given the paper. Thus, under the shelter of the crown, Whiston escaped altogether. The book was condemned by the convocation, but the condemnation could not be carried into effect, because it was not confirmed by the crown."*

The same queen had already given an illustration of her supreme power over the spiritualty of her realm. In 1714, she empowered convocation to prepare a form for admitting converts

* Apud Cooper, 1, p. 60.

to the Church of Rome, and such as renounced her errors; which convocation accordingly drew up, but which does not appear to have received the royal sanction.

In the reign of Charles I. the Reformed Church of Ireland passed from the profession of Calvinism, in that expression of it known by the name of the 'Irish articles,' to the patch-work standard of belief which, under the name of the thirty-nine articles, Queen Elizabeth had imposed on the Church of England. This curious transformation was effected by the determination of the Lord Deputy Wentworth, (Lord Strafford,) whose conduct on the occasion referred to furnishes a most satisfactory proof of the point I have undertaken to establish. Nothing shows better the utter futility of every effort made by the reformed clergy to maintain even the shadow of independence in their relations, with the crown, than the fact that Archbishop Usher, one of the most learned men that Protestantism has produced, was unable to resist the influence of the representative of royalty. Dr. Lingard thus narrates the circumstance.

"This ample grant (of money to the crown) could not save the Irish clergy from the mortification which had been prepared for them by Archbishop Laud, who deemed it an object of the first importance to unite the protestant churches of England, Scotland and Ireland, in the profession of the same doctrine and the observance of the same discipline. The Irish prelates demurred. Theirs, they contended, was a distinct and independent church; they owed no obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury; they were satisfied of the truth of the Irish articles, erroneous as they might appear to the enemies of Calvin, and the admirers of Arminius. The deputy sought at first to soothe their feelings. He assured them that no claim of superiority was set up by the English metropolitan; he was willing that the Irish articles, the idols of their adoration, should be suffered to die away without censure or notice; he even granted them permission to compose a new code of ecclesiastical discipline. But at the same time he required that this code, how much soever it might differ in form, should not depart in substance from that of the English Church, and that one of its canons should include an unlimited admission of the thirty-nine articles. To his surprise he was informed that, in defiance of his command, the divines, intrusted with the compilation, had introduced a canon enjoining the admission of the Irish articles,

under the penalty of excommunication. He sent for the Archbishop (Usher) and the committee, took the minutes into his own possession, reproached the chairman with having acted the part of Arminius, and forbade him to make any report of the proceedings to the convocation. He then imposed on Usher the task of framing a canon authorizing the English articles; but the labour of the primate did not give satisfaction; Wentworth drew one himself, and sent it to the house, with orders that no debate should be permitted, and that the names of those who voted against it should be reported to him. One man only was found, who dared to dissent; the rest submitted with feelings of indignation and shame."*

Let us pass from convocation to the ecclesiastical courts, as they are misnamed; they being lay courts for ecclesiastical affairs; the king in them disregarding even the appearance of respect for the spiritual authority; and not content with making ecclesiastics *his* agents, discarding even their subordinate action in the adjudication of spiritual affairs. This plague spot of the establishment has already been incidentally mentioned, but deserves a closer examination.

"The *act of submission*," says Mr. Cooper, "was at the same time the *statute of appeals*. Thus the law was the King's. Of an *ecclesiastical* he made it a *secular* code. The judges were his. He named them; bishops, officials, all as they were. The adjudications were his; for they subsisted but by his sufferance; and in the reign of young Edward, ran in his name."† It is by virtue of the provisions of this act that even the shadow of ecclesiastical authority has been taken from the Church of England. The bishop must have a chancellor, whose jurisdiction is no less ordinary than that of the bishop, and equally recognized by the law; held by the same tenure, secured by the same sanction, and, equally with the bishop's, an essential part of church government. "His overseership," says Mr. Cooper, "inferior perhaps in dignity, but certainly superior in jurisdiction, is co-extensive with that of the bishop; ranging over the entire extent of the diocese, and embracing within its operation clergy and laity alike; and, in certain cases, clergy of the highest rank—I mean bishops." "It is only through courts

* Hist. of England, Vol. IX., pp. 338–340; Stafford Papers, I., 298, 329, 342, 381; Wilkins' Conc., IV., 496, 516.

† P. 70.

so constituted," says the present Bishop of Salisbury, in a visitation charge to his clergy, "that whatever power of spiritual discipline exists in the Church, is capable of being exercised. As matters now stand it is only by means of these courts that spiritual offences can, in any manner, be visited by the censures of the Church; or, that, as a last resource, unworthy members can be cut off from the fellowship of the body of Christ."* And yet, Bishop Bedel, as reported by Burnet, tells us that "it is one of the most essential parts of a bishop's duty to govern his flock, and to inflict spiritual censures on obstinate offenders, and he can no more delegate this power to a layman than he can delegate a power to baptize and ordain." Parliament, however, or the royal supreme governor of the Church of England on earth, can as validly give such power to laymen, as to clergymen; and the fallacy of Anglican writers in the reproaches which, on this subject, they make the State, is to suppose that it could give jurisdiction on spiritual matters to clergymen or to laymen. This must be remembered, while reading the following description of the piteous degradation to which the spiritual authority has been brought—not by the act of the State—but by the Church, which alone could surrender its rights.

"It will be admitted," says a recent writer, "that one important function of a church is to take care that its accredited teachers should preach sound doctrine. It was with a view to this, indeed, that the Church of England prescribed a liturgy and articles. And it would be by reference to these that the orthodoxy of the instruction given by any of its ministers would be properly judged of. But who is to institute the comparison? A bishop, of course, may examine into the matter and come to his decision; but what then? If the minister, indeed, be a curate he might perhaps be deprived of his license. But suppose the heterodox minister were a rector, the decision in the matter would be subjected, before his removal from his parish could be enforced,—not to the examination of other bishops,—not to any selected body of the clergy,—not to any body, in fact, necessarily belonging to the communion of our Church,—but to twelve men, taken by the sheriff at random from general society,—men who may be very respectable as citizens, and very competent to give a just decision in matters of property

* P. 29; apud Cooper, p. 159.

and of trade,—but whose fitness for deciding an abstract opinion of religion had never been ascertained,—men who may themselves hold any opinion, however heterodox, or men who may have never risen to the dignity of holding any opinion whatsoever in religion. It would be before such a tribunal that the question would have finally to be settled. The bishop would be, as it were, arraigned before them, and compelled to give them an account of his proceedings as a bishop. This is the state of the law arising out of the fact, that the Church of England (unlike every other religious denomination) possesses within itself no power of determining claims to membership; but is this a condition, in which the prelates of the Church should be exhibited?"*

Dr. Whately, the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, frankly avowed "that on most of the points (controverted within the Church) a bishop's declarations have no more weight, except what they may derive from the deference paid to his personal character, than any anonymous pamphlet would have. The points are mostly such as he has no *official* power to decide, even in reference to his own diocese; and as to legislation for the Church, or authoritative declarations on many of the most important matters, *neither any one bishop nor all collectively* have any more right of this kind than the ordinary magistrates have, to take on themselves the functions of Parliament."†

What the bishops cannot do, the lay president of the Court of Arches is, however, able to effect.

The reader has already seen how the question of the validity of lay-baptism was practically resolved. The same learned judge, whose name has been mentioned in connection with that decision, has also determined another point of doctrine, namely, that prayers for the dead are not incompatible with the doctrine of the Church of England. Some few years ago Mary Woolfrey, widow, was cited before the ecclesiastical court, by the Vicar of Carisbroke, (England) for having caused to be cut on the tomb-stone, erected to the memory of her husband, in the churchyard of that place, the words "Pray for the soul of John Woolfrey," as also the text from II. Machabees, xii. 46, "It is therefore

* Appeal on Church Government, p. 63.—This publication, says Mr. Cooper, immediately on its appearance, attracted the notice, and has since, at the distance of three years, elicited the renewed commendation of His Grace, the protestant Archbishop of Dublin.

† Charge of 1843, p. 22.

a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins." The vicar objected to this inscription, because, as he asserted, it was contrary to the sentiments of the Church of England. But Sir Herbert Jenner dismissed the suit; and, in an elaborate sentence, pronounced on the occasion, decided that prayer for the dead was not contrary to the doctrine of the Church; and that, as the book of Macchabees was among those which, although not held to be inspired, might be read in churches, there could be no objection to the text taken from it being placed on a tomb-stone.

Bishop Crofts says: "If there be any thing in the office of a bishop to be challenged, peculiar to themselves, certainly it should be this (inflicting and removing censures). Yet this is, in a manner, quite relinquished to their chancellors; laymen, who have no more capacity to censure or absolve a sinner, than to dissolve the heavens and the earth. And this pretended power of the chancellor is sometimes purchased with a sum of money.* Their money perish with them! Good God! what a horrid abuse is this of the Divine authority! But this notorious transgression is excused, they think, by this, that a minister, called a bishop's surrogate,

* The following extract from Burnet's Life of Bishop Bedel, will best explain the above allusion.—"It (the court) was managed by a chancellor that had bought his place from his predecessor, and so thought he had a right to all the profits he could raise out of it; and the whole business of the court seemed to be nothing but extortion and oppression. For it is an old observation, that men who buy justice will also sell it. Bribes went about almost as barefaced; and the exchange they made of penance for money, was the worst sort of simony, being, in effect, the very same abuse that gave the world such a scandal, when it was so indecently practised in the Church of Rome, and opened the way to the Reformation; for the selling of indulgences is really but a commutation of penance. The officers of the court made it their business to draw people into trouble by vexatious suits, and to hold them so long in it, that for three pence worth of the tithe of turf, they would be put to five pounds charge. And the solemnest and sacredest of all the church's censures, which was excommunication, went about in so sordid and so base a manner, that all regard to it, as a spiritual censure, was lost; and the effect it had in law, made it to be cried out on as a most intolerable piece of tyranny." Bishop Williams used to call it "the rusty old sword of the church."—Cooper, p. 163. "It cannot be expected that a separation from the communion of the Church should affect the minds of sinners with any degree of terror and remorse, when they see persons of the most unblamable lives, put into the very same state, by the very same hands, upon occasions merely civil and secular, in causes which wholly terminate in temporal profit, and have not the least reference to religion and the souls of men." "Disciplina nostra jam solas crumenas pulsat," says Bishop Andrews, "ut consulatur potius ovium attonsioni quam attentioni, et fisco quam Christo." "It would be easy," says Archdeacon Wilberforce, "to produce similar complaints from every part of our history."—Apud Cooper, p. 167.

but who is indeed the chancellor's servant, chosen, called, and placed there by him, to be his crier in the court, no better ;—that when he (the chancellor) hath examined, heard, and sentenced the cause, then the minister, forsooth, pronounces the sentence. Just as if the rector of a parish church should exclude any of his congregation, and lock him out of the church ; then comes the clerk, shews and fingers the keys, that all may take notice that he is excluded. And by this authority the chancellor takes upon him to sentence not only laymen, but clergymen also, brought into his court for any delinquency ; and in the Court of Arches sentences even bishops themselves."*

This extraordinary state of things leaves the Anglican bishops without any authority in correcting the morals of their clergy, or removing the scandals they may not be able to prevent. A case of very flagrant immorality occurred not many years since in the diocese of Peterborough, England. Public attention was directed to the circumstance, and the expression of its indignation was loud and vehement. In his place in the house of lords, the Bishop of Peterborough was asked, why he had not visited the culprit with due and canonical punishment ; but he replied that by 'the Church discipline act,' he was unable to do so; the delinquent being a rector! It was stated in the *Standard* newspaper, at the time, that it would require an act of parliament to remove him. A similar manifestation of the same humiliating fact was made, some short time since, in the archdiocese of Dublin. The cause came before one of the civil tribunals, when one of the judges, speaking from the impulse of common sense, ventured to censure the archbishop for not having prevented the publicity the scandal had attained, by taking "the case in his own hands and deciding it in his study." In his own defence, Dr. Whately was compelled to come forward ; and he "vindicated himself," says Mr. Cooper, "by stating that the law left him no such power."†

If the Church of England cannot enforce, by ecclesiastical cen-

* Naked Truth, p. 58 ; apud Cooper, p. 160.

† By a recent law, when it is a presbyter who is being tried, they must call in the aid of an episcopal assessor ; but when it is a bishop who is on his trial, then the laymen are the exclusive judges; the bishop must retire from the judgment seat.—So described by the Bishop of Exeter's Charge, p. 45. "It is clear," says Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce, referring to the present subject, "that the judgment of those great luminaries whom our church has been used to regard as authorities, would declare her *absolute forfeiture* of her peculiar privileges."—Church Courts and Church Discipline, p. 13.

sures, the rules of discipline among her clergy, she is not permitted even to establish and prescribe canons which may morally bind the laity. She has made canons, but has never been able to obtain from the legislature their approval, which, as she derives her whole power from the state, is essentially required, in order that they become laws, which her people may be conscientiously bound to observe. This was declared more than two centuries ago, and is not denied by any one conversant with the subject.

"We are all of opinion," says Lord Hardwicke, giving the decision of the court in the case of *Middleton* and *Croft*, "that the canons of 1603, *not having been confirmed by parliament*, do not, *proprio vigore*, bind the laity, I say, *proprio vigore;* for there are many provisions contained in these canons, which are declaratory of the ancient usage and law of the Church of England, received and allowed here, which in that respect, and by virtue of such ancient allowance, will bind the laity; but that is an obligation antecedent to, and not arising from this body of canons. In all the acts of parliament since the Reformation, for confirming forms of prayer, and other ecclesiastical constitutions, the preambles show that the clergy in convocation were only considered as the proper assembly, *to prepare and propound them, but not to enact or to give them their force.* It was objected indeed in this argument, (by the counsel in the case,) that the confirmation in parliament did not give being to them, as laws to bind the laity, but was designed merely to enforce them by the addition of temporal penalties. But that is not the only reason, although it is one. *The true use of these confirmations in parliament, was the extension of such constitutions over the laity, who would otherwise not be bound.*"

In the synod of 1603, a canon (the penultimate) was enacted, which pronounced anathema on those who would affirm that none, *either* of the clergy or laity, but those then present in convocation, were subject to its decrees. The synod was afraid to say plainly that the laity were bound by its acts; and the effort made shortly afterwards in the House of Lords to give this construction to the distributive canon of 1603, was defeated by the firmness of the legislature.*

* Lingard, Vol. IX., p. 29, 4th ed.—"As for the canon of 1603, enacted by the clergy under James I., and never confirmed by parliament, it has been solemnly adjudged upon the principles of the law, and of the constitution, that where they

In 1840 and 1843 the archbishop of Dublin presented to the House of Lords petitions from certain bodies of clergy and laity, praying for the establishment of a church legislature. In his address on the latter occasion, he said, that "Parliament has *alone* the power to legislate for the church," (p. 30.) "And that by *power* he means rights," observes Mr. Cooper, "is plain from the context. He declares solemnly, that *rights* carry with them *duties*, and above all legislative rights; and if the parliament, which had alone the power of legislating for the church, did not consider its intervention on this subject proper, it was the duty of parliament to *permit* some other body, whose province it should legitimately be, to interpose with a regular and recognized authority for the settling of the disputes and dissensions now unfortunately prevailing. He alluded, of course, to spiritual matters alone, matters of doctrine and discipline."*

These facts and authorities furnish abundant evidence of the secular character of the Church of England, and show that the claim to apostolical succession on the part of that church is refuted by her entire incapability of exercising any of the functions of the apostolate. "She can do no act," eloquently remarks Mr. Cooper, "utter no sound, effect no result, but as she is prompted by the state. When she acts, it is the state that acts by and through her. She is but a convenient mask, to disguise and keep

are not merely declaratory of the ancient canon law, but are introductory of new regulations, they do not bind the laity, *whatever* regard the clergy may think proper to pay them."—Blackstone, Vol. I., p. 83. Another law authority, Judge Forster, one of the contemporaries of Lord Hardwicke, whose decision is given in the text, thus describes the effects of the *Act of Submission* on the clergy:—"All future convocations of the body spiritual for the making of canons, are by this Act laid under greater restraint than, I think, any petty corporation or trading company in the kingdom was ever subject to with regard to its bye-laws. Indeed, all fraternities, which have power to make bye-laws for their better government, have it under this restriction, that their ordinances shall not be repugnant to the prerogative, or to the laws and customs of the realm. But the subjecting every person making, promulging, or executing ordinances repugnant to the prerogative or to the laws of the kingdom, to fine and imprisonment, at the king's will, is a severity peculiar to the case of his lordship's spiritual legislature, (convocation.) Of the same kind is the proviso, that the clergy in convocation shall not, under the like penalty, attempt any canons, (or, as it has been expounded by very great authority, shall not so much as confer, in order to the making any canon,) without the royal license first obtained. These, I say, are instances of caution and severity, peculiar to the case of synodical bye-laws, which nothing but the experience of grievous misbehaviour on the part of the clergy in times past, joined with apprehensions of future transgression in the same way, could have suggested."—Judge Forster; Examination of Scheme of Church Power, etc., p. 88. Dublin, 1735.

* P. 30.

out of view the real agents in the case, her temporal masters. From herself she has no inward impulse, no principle of life, no spring of self action ; she is but a piece of state mechanism clumsily put together, ready to fall in pieces at every shock, and requiring at the hand of her original maker, the legislature, constant refittings and remodellings to bring her into harmony with the social system and the changes that are going on around her. The state controls her deliberations, guides her councils, dictates her decisions, or strikes them with her ban, and they are none. The state presides in her judicatories, and revises and reverses her awards. The state makes and unmakes her bishops, makes and unmakes her discipline, makes and unmakes her very dogmas, as I am ready to prove! She is at this moment torn and convulsed by internal dissensions, not alone among her people, but her pastors ; and, although the strife rages and schism is preying upon her vitals, she possesses within her no recuperative force to purge the virus from her veins. Like the Hebrew mother, she carries in her womb two hostile nations, and they are threatening her existence, and she is unable to expel them from her loins. Her divines are hurling anathemas at each other ; and *heretic* and *heterodox* and *traitor to church vows*, and every term of reproach which the foul vocabulary of theologic spite can supply is in requisition, to evince the cordiality of hate with which they regard each other ; yet though they demonstrate that one at least must be wrong, and in all probability both, still the heresy, the unsoundness remains ; she is unable to clear it out from her system ; and why? *The state will not let her.* They are clamouring for the guilty one's excommunication, but in vain ; *the state will not permit it.* The people are distracted ; their guides beckon them in contrary directions, and all these diverging ways, save perhaps one, must lead to death. Why does she not point out which they should follow. *The state will not let her.* Opposed to each other as night is to day, one party at least must be in darkness. Why leave the simple multitude to be led by ‹ blind leaders of the blind?' Why not take her light from under the bushel and place it on the mountain top, that her children may rejoice in its radiance, and start back from the pit-fall which yawns at their feet? *The state will not let it.* One portion of her bishops proclaims with Dr. Philpots to the world, the vast, the incomparably vast importance of unity, while another portion laments with Dr.

Whately, that this unity is shattered in a thousand pieces within her pale. Why does she not arise and snatch from their sacrilegious fury the seamless garment of Christ? *The state will not let her.* Her formularies are ambiguous. Why does she not cease to speak with stammering lips? *The state will not cut the ligaments of her tongue.*"*

This utter powerlessness shows that, under the forms of what once was life, the principle of life no longer exists in the Church of England; that, *as a Church*, it has had no independent existence, since the accession of Elizabeth to the throne in that country; and that, so far from being a medium through which the jurisdiction given by Christ to the apostles, could have been transmitted, its history supplies an illustration of the awful sentence pronounced on the salt that loses its savour: "IT IS GOOD FOR NOTHING ANY MORE, BUT TO BE CAST OUT AND TO BE TRODDEN ON BY MEN."

I have accumulated the foregoing facts and authorities, for the purpose of placing in a clear light the nature and extent of that jurisdiction, which the crown of England has uniformly claimed and exercised since the change of religion, miscalled the Reformation, in that country. It is a subject deserving the attentive consideration of all who are agreed on the principle, that the saving doctrines of the gospel are to be learned from a ministry, which has derived not only the *power* to minister in sacred things, but also the right to *exercise* that power, in an uninterrupted series from the apostles of Christ.

* P. 238.

APPENDIX.

I.

Father Courayer, whose name occurs so frequently in the preceding pages, is regarded by all as the best advocate of the English ordinations. The extraordinary, and to some, perhaps, startling, fact, that a Catholic priest should be found impugning the practice of his own Church, and maintaining the validity of Anglican orders, against the prevailing opinion of Catholic theologians, seems to require a sketch of his character. The following notice is from the pen of Mr. Charles Butler, whom no one acquainted with his writings will accuse of being unjust towards the enemies of the Church.*

DOCTOR COURAYER.

Soon after the reformation was established in England by Queen Elizabeth, a controversy arose on the validity of the ordinations of the clergy of the church of England. Dodd gives, in his Church History,† a full view of the principal facts and arguments produced by the writers on each side. The controversy was renewed by Mr. Thomas Ward in 1719: a work,‡ written by him on the subject, was much read, and produced several answers. Some publications on the same subject,—as the "*Memoires sur la validité des ordinations des Anglois*," of the abbé Renaudot—appeared on the continent. They attracted the attention of Peter Francis Courayer, a canon regular of St. Génévieve at Paris. In the disputes on jansenism he had taken an active part, and was among those who appealed from the Bull Unigenitus. In 1723, he pub-

* Historical Memoirs of the English Catholics, Vol. III., p. 187–190.
† Vol. II., p. 269, et seq.
‡ "The Controversy of ordination truly stated."

lished his "*Dissertation sur la validité des Ordinations des Anglois, et sur la succession des Evêques de l' Eglise Anglicane,*— which was immediately translated into English. Replies to it were published by the abbé Gervaise, Mr. Fennel, and the fathers Hardouin and le Quien of the Society of Jesus;* that of father le Quien was considered to be most ably written. Father Courayer published a defence of his work in 1726. The university of Oxford presented him with a diploma, conferring upon him the degree of doctor of laws.

Understanding that his liberty was in danger, he took refuge in England, and was kindly received by Dr. Wake, then archbishop of Canterbury, and by Dr. Sherlock, bishop of London; a pension was settled on him. His work was censured in France, first by the Cardinal de Noailles, then by two different assemblies of bishops, one at Paris, another at Embrun, and finally by a bull of Pope Benedict the fourteenth. As a reply to these he published his "*Relation historique et apologétique des sentimens et de la conduite du Père le Courayer, chanoine regulier de Ste. Généviéve.*"—He afterwards published French translations with notes of "Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent," and Sleidan's "History of the Reformation." He died in 1776, at the advanced age of ninety-five, retaining to the last his mental faculties. He was well received at the court of George the second, and particularly noticed by Queen Caroline and the Princess Amelia. Having lived in intimacy with many persons of distinction both in France and England, and being possessed of extensive literary information, his conversation was singularly pleasing and instructive. He always professed himself to be a sincere member of the Roman Catholic religion, and attended mass regularly on Sundays and holydays, when his health permitted, and an opportunity of doing it, offered; but, when this was not the case, he attended the service of the parish church.

After the decease of Courayer, Dr. Bell, prebendary of Westminster, published his last sentiments, under the title of "*Declaration de mes derniers sentimens sur les différens dogmes de la Religion, par feu Pierre Francois le Courayer.*" The manuscript of it had been given by him to the princess Amelia, about nine years before his death. He professes in it to die a member of the Ro-

* Here Mr. Butler is mistaken. Father le Quien was a Dominican, not a Jesuit.

man Catholic Church; but the contents of it make it evident that he could not be accounted a member of that, or any other established church. In 1814, a more full exposition of his religious sentiments, intituled, "Traité où l'on expose ce que l'Ecriture nous apprend, de la Divinité de Jesus Christ," was published by Dr. Bell. From these works the general laxity of Père Courayer on religious subjects plainly appears.

II.

TO THE REV. THOS. ELRINGTON, D. D.

Late Senior Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.

Rev. Sir,

Until the present day, I had been for some time past resolved, and indeed prepared to send you a detailed answer to your late work, entitled: "The Clergy of the Church of England truly ordained, and not obliged to subscribe to damnable contradictions, in answer to Ward's Controversy of Ordination," the rough draft of which reply is now lying before me; and though, Sir, I am sensible of the advantage I hereby give you, in the possible event of a serious debate between us on the subject in question, I am resolved to lay before you an outline of the answer which I intended to make to you.

I begin my treatise, Sir, with stating my motive for replying to you; namely, your implied attack upon me; for you expressly say: "I wish to be understood, whenever I name Mr. Ward, to mean the person who has adopted and published his book, and, by so doing, made himself responsible for it, as if he had really been the author of it, and had written it at the present time."* Now, as it is publicly known that I have constantly been charged with being the publisher of that book, and as this charge has been brought against no one else but me, it is plain that your very severe blows are aimed at me. I then demonstrate the egregious mistake you are under in this particular, as also in supposing my episcopal brethren to have been encouragers of the obnoxious work. In a word, Sir, I prove you to be a literary Quixotte, who fancy yourself combating with a host of gigantic foes, whilst you are only tilting at the puny speculation of a bookseller!

* Note p. 7.

In the next place, I disclaim the attempt of diving into all this long and intricate controversy, because, on one hand, it is of a nature so peculiarly irritating to the Clergy of the Established Church, and because, on the other, it is of no sort of consequence to the defence or truth of my own Church; on the contrary, I profess to content myself with barely refuting the arguments of Dr. Elrington, and with showing that he, like Dr. Ryan, injures the cause which he undertakes to support.——I begin by proving that he injures it at his very outset; since of the four alleged Catholic authors whom he appeals to as favourable to his cause,* two of them were excommunicated for their errors, the third was only saved from this censure on the same account, through the interference of a great King, and the fourth, Bossuet, speaks of the orders of the Church of England in such opprobrious terms, that I should feel greater repugnance in publishing his words, than all the rest of my treatise put together.

I then demonstrate that Dr. Elrington does still greater injustice to his cause, by the too extended ground upon which he places it; and here I show my candor to him, as I did before to Dr. Ryan, by refusing to take advantage of an important concession which he improperly makes to me.——The first question, in order to decide upon the invalidity of the English Ordinations, is, whether Mathew Parker, the first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury in Queen Elizabeth's reign, was duly consecrated? The Lambeth Register, (which Ward pretends is a forgery) mentions three Bishops (besides a suffragan) as assisting at his consecration, Barlow, Scory, and Coverdale. The next question, then, is, whether these men themselves had received episcopal consecration? It answered Ward's purpose, in different respects, to depreciate these apostate friars† as much as was in his power, and to deny that any one of the three had been consecrated. Nevertheless, layman as he was, he knew too much of theology, to assert that a defect in the orders of the *assistant Prelates*, Scory and Coverdale, would have invalidated the consecration of Parker, provided only the *consecrating Prelate*, Barlow, had himself been

* P. 3.

† Coverdale and Scory were apostate friars, and Barlow an apostate monk. They all three abjured their vows of chastity and religion to follow the liberty of the new gospel. But the two latter abandoned it and returned to their ancient faith in Mary's time, which they again abjured under Elizabeth. Coverdale kept himself abroad during that time.

consecrated,* and that he used the proper form for that purpose. Accordingly, he speaks of Barlow as of a man "who had been imposed upon the nation for such a Bishop, that on him *must be be built, as on a foundation*, the whole Episcopacy and Priesthood of the Church of England."† Now Dr. Elrington, as I show, very unwarily, as well as very untheologically, admits, that "if Ward could prove that *Scory* and *Coverdale* (in addition to Barlow) were *not truly Bishops*, it would then follow that *Parker also was not a Bishop*, and the succession of the English Clergy would be destroyed."‡ It is here to be observed, that Ward has adduced some very strong documents, though not so many as he might have done, against the consecration of Scory and Coverdale, arguments which Dr. E. is far from having answered in a satisfactory way.

Having enlarged upon this capital blunder of Dr. Elrington, I proceed to the grand inquiry: whether Barlow, who is named as the consecrating Bishop of Mathew Parker, is proved by Ward's antagonist to have himself received episcopal consecration. Ward argues, and it is admitted on all hands, that though special mention is made in the registers of Barlow's *appointment* to the See of St. David's in the year 1535, and of his *confirmation* in it by Archbishop Cranmer, there is no hint of the important circumstance of his *consecration*. Now this defect Dr. E. endeavours to supply by a number of presumptive proofs, which of course I am put upon examining. I show, then, that this gentleman is under an egregious mistake in supposing that Barlow's *ranking as a Bishop*, and being *admitted as such* to the bench of Bishops in Parliament and in synods, and his being translated to other sees, and even being present, as an *assisting prelate* at the consecration of other bishops, are any proofs of his having been *consecrated himself*. Arguing on this head from canon law and ecclesiastical history, I show that it is *episcopal confirmation* alone which gives the Prelate *authority to govern his diocese*, and which properly *makes him the Bishop of it*, together with every *right*, *privilege*, and *power* belonging to a Bishop except the power of conferring orders and confirming children, even though he *never should be*

* It is true, the ancient as well as the modern canons prescribe, that three bishops should be present at a consecration. But this is barely a *precept*, not an *essential condition*. It appears by the form used in the Church of England, as well as in the Catholic Church, that only one prelate is considered as the consecrator.

† P. 15. ‡ P. 3.

consecrated at all: whereas if he were even consecrated for a diocese, without being confirmed for it, he would have no right, privilege, or power in it whatever. In this manner I repress the empty triumph of Dr. E. over poor Ward. In like manner I show that the act of parliament under Henry VIII., which the Doctor refers to, adds no weight to his opinion, as it was made to restrain the power of the Pope, not that of the King; that Barlow himself, so far from making any account of consecration, publicly preached (which he could have no reason for doing, unless to excuse his own want of consecration) "that if the King's Grace, being Supreme Head of the Church, did denominate any layman to be a Bishop, he would be as good a Bishop as himself, or the best in England:" moreover, that his metropolitan Cranmer, whose business it was, according to the canons, to enforce Barlow's consecration within three months from his appointment, taught and subscribed, in records which I refer to, the same anti-episcopal doctrine which Barlow preached, and that he and most of his time-serving brethren acted upon this principle, when they petitioned the child Edward VI. for a renewal of their episcopal powers, on the scandalous plea that they had terminated with the life of Henry VIII., which powers they were content to receive and hold like a civil office, "*Durante beneplacito;*" and "Quamdiu se bene gesserint."

Such being the prevailing low-church notions of the prelates themselves about Consecration and Apostolical Succession, in conformity with those of the foreign Protestants* at the beginning of the reformation, it might seem useless to take notice of the concessions of the early Protestant writers of this country, or the reproaches of their contemporary Catholic antagonists on the subject; nevertheless, as Dr. E. is so extremely warm, and even violent in his language against Ward concerning it, I go through both these chapters, and I show that, so far from disarming the latter, he puts new weapons into his hands, or the hands of those who choose to fight his battles.—In conclusion, being foiled in all his attempts to answer Ward's objections on the subject of Barlow's ordination, (the main hinge, as I observed, on which that of Parker turns) the

* The Catholic Bishop of Naumberg being dead, Luther, a private monk, consecrated his own pot companion, Nicholas Amsdorf, to succeed him.—Sleidan, Comment., 1, 14. This Amsdorf taught that "good works, so far from being a help, were an impediment to salvation."—Mosheim's Eccl. Hist., by Maclaine, Vol. IV., p. 328.

Doctor has recourse to retorsion, and addressing himself to Ward's supposed publisher, that is to me, he indignantly asks me, whether I do not know that twelve other bishops, whom he names, labour under the same disadvantage that Barlow does, in having no register of their consecration?* This challenge, of course, puts me upon investigating the matter; the result of which is a discovery, that of the twelve Bishops whom he sets down as unregistered, two of them never existed in the sees for which he names them; and with respect to the remaining ten, I produce the consecration registers of them all except one, who, as I give reason to believe, was consecrated at Rome.

But beside the question relative to Barlow's being a *consecrated* bishop, there is another grand question, as you know, sir, relating to the validity of the form which he must have made use of on the occasion in question; or rather, of the forms in general which

* One of these prelates was the mild and edifying Cardinal Pole, concerning whose register of consecration, as well as his conduct, I demonstrate that Dr. Elrington is guilty of the most inexcusable misrepresentation. Two instances of this, namely, that the Cardinal "made the see of Canterbury vacant by the murder of Cranmer," and that "he took possession of it on the first Sunday after that murder,"—P. 106, I refute by the arguments of the learned Anthony Harmer, (Henry Wharton, Chaplain to Archbishop Sancroft,) in his "Specimen of Errors in Burnet's History of the Reformation." This author shows that Cranmer was dead in the eye of the statute and canon law of England, and, therefore, no longer in possession of the archbishopric, upon his being attainted of high treason against Mary and Elizabeth, the two daughters of his benefactor, Henry VIII., in favour of Jane Grey, two years and a half before his execution; and that, soon after his condemnation, he became equally dead in the eye of the Catholic canon law, in consequence of his being deposed and excommunicated by the Pope: so that his natural life was not the smallest obstacle to the advancement of the Cardinal, or of any other person to the archbishopric. Accordingly, the latter was chosen and confirmed archbishop, and put in full possession of all the spiritualities and temporalities belonging to the see long before Cranmer's death. Nevertheless, it so happened from different causes, that he could not be ordained priest; and, of course, could not be consecrated till about the time of Cranmer's death. If Ward or I had committed any such egregious blunders, though with no malicious intention, Dr. E. would have exclaimed, in his usual style and with a note of admiration, *Proh Pudor!* How averse the Cardinal was from those horrid scenes of blood which disgraced the latter part of Mary's reign, all historians testify. And how gladly he would have saved Cranmer's life, at the expense of all the honours and emoluments of the archbishopric which he was then in possession of, is seen in his humane and edifying letter to that unhappy time-serving prelate, of which the following is an extract: "Si te ab horribili illa, quæ tibi, nisi resipiscas, impendet (non solum corporis sed etiam animæ) mortis sententiâ, ullo modo liberare possem, id profecto omnibus divitiis atque honoribus, Deum testor, libentissime anteponerem."—Inter Epist. Poli,—— How different a disposition Cranmer himself evinced whilst he was in power, by the crowds of victims (and those mostly Protestants, and for being Protestants,) whom he sent to the fire, I have shown in my Letters to a Prebendary.—See Letter V., p. 175. 4th edit

were universally used by the Established Church, as well in the ordination of Priests as in the consecration of Bishops, down to the year 1662, when these forms were altered. The subject is delicate, and therefore I shall touch it very slightly and briefly. What Ward maintains, arguing the point from reason and authority, is in substance this. In conferring the peculiar office and power annexed to each holy order, it is essential that a form should be used by the Prelate consecrating or ordaining, expressive of the peculiar office and power intended to be conferred: whereas he says, the form of consecrating bishops,* as it stands in the old Ritual, composed by Cranmer, is just as proper for the ceremony of confirming, or laying hands upon children,† as it is for conferring the powers of the Episcopacy. He likewise argues that the form of ordaining Priests is equally defective. To this objection Dr. Elrington makes different answers. He says that the mere circumstances of this man being presented for Priesthood and that for Episcopacy, &c., sufficiently determine the power which each candidate receives from the officiating Prelate. To this I reply: then *no form whatever is necessary* in giving orders, but the whole may be performed by dumb show. Speaking of the Priesthood in particular, the Doctor asserts that it is and ever was conferred in his Church by the self-same form (Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, &c.) by which it is conferred in ours: and then addressing me he indignantly asks: "Will Mr. Ward's editor call the validity of the orders conferred in the Church of Rome in question?"‡ This challenge I answer in my detailed letter, (of which I am here giving a rough outline) by a dissertation on the essential *constituent power* of Priesthood, which I prove, from Scripture, the holy Fathers, the Canons, and the Rituals of all Christian Churches, in the East and in the West,

* The following is the ancient form devised by Cranmer. The archbishop says to the prelate elect: "Take the Holy Ghost and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness."

† In cutting down the Catholic Missal, Breviary, Ritual, and Pontifical into the Book of Common Prayer, and that of making and consecrating Bishops, Priests, &c., as well as in framing the Articles, it is plain that Cranmer and his fellow labourers were divided between the fear of the objections of the Catholics on one hand, and that of incurring the censure of John Calvin, who continued for a long time to dictate to them from Geneva, on the other.—See Fox's Acts and Monuments. In no instance does Cranmer's spirit of Presbyterianism appear so plain, as in his form of consecrating bishops.

‡ P. 22.

from the time of the Apostles down to that of the Reformation, and from the sentiments and practice of God's servants, since the beginning of the world, consists in the *power of offering up sacrifice.* Hence, though you and I should both agree that your form conveys the power of forgiving and retaining sins, Ward intimates that it is still essentially defective, in as much as it neither confers nor is intended to confer the power of sacrificing.—It is true the Doctor appeals to some ancient liturgies and modern divines against Ward's argument concerning the necessity of appropriate forms of conferring orders. But here also I meet him in an ample discussion of the ancient Canons, Sacramentaries, and Treatises on this subject, from the Apostolical Constitutions down to the passage inserted by him from Bossuet; which very passage, without quoting his other very harsh and offensive words, I show makes against the Doctor instead of making for him.

In conclusion, Ward asks in substance this question; (for studying, as I do, perspicuity and brevity, I take his meaning rather than his words): "In case Cranmer's old indeterminate forms of ordination and consecration were valid and sufficient, what occasion was there for changing them to a more determinate form in 1662?"* Here Dr. Elrington finds himself quite embarrassed, and is unable to give any better answer than the following: "Two forms may be sufficient and valid, and yet one may be preferable to the other."† Had he been acquainted with the circumstances of the case, his embarrassment would have been much greater. These I will mention, without making any comment upon or drawing any conclusion from them. The celebrated Chillingworth had an intimate friend, as persons acquainted with his history know, the Rev. John Lewgar, S. T. B. When he entered into the pale of the Catholic Church, he took his friend along with him, and when he deserted it, as being too confined for his belief and practice, he tried to lead back his friend; but he tried in vain. This friend gave himself up in a particular manner to the study of the ordination controversy, upon which he pub-

* The words marked below in italics are those which were added in 1662 to the ancient form; and these, with other alterations, were sanctioned by the Act of Uniformity, passed in the same year. "Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands in the name of the Father, &c.*, and remember that thou stir up, &c." ——"Receive the Holy Ghost *for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed to thee by the imposition of our hands.* Whose sins thou dost forgive, &c."

† P. 24.

lished different tracts. His most famous tract, entitled *Erastus Senior*, now before me, in which he argues strongly against the vague, indeterminate form then in use, was published in the above-mentioned year, at a time when the convocation was sitting, and when, in consequence of the conferences with the Dissenters, which had been held at the Savoy, several important changes in the Liturgy were agreed upon. To be brief, the force of Lewgar's arguments was felt, and the ordination and consecration forms were altered to their present state; but whether that was done in due time to obviate Ward's objection I need not here mention.

Besides the controversy about orders, you have a second controversy with Ward, or rather with his supposed editor, concerning the Homilies. In defence of these Homilies, now so generally neglected and contradicted by your brethren, you throw down the gauntlet in a manner which renders you answerable for the contents of the whole of them. Indeed, your hardihood is almost unparalleled, when you undertake to reconcile the contradictory passages in these antiquated sermons which Ward has pointed out.—— One of these passages asserts that "All sects and degrees of men, women, and children, of whole Christendom, have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry; of all other sins most detested of God, and most damnable to men, by the space of eight hundred years and more!"* while the other teaches that the Holy Ghost has been always present, governing and preserving the Church from the beginning, &c.† To get out of this dilemma in which Ward has placed you, or rather in which you have placed yourself, you alternately try to break each of its horns, but to no sort of purpose. You first tell us, (after a copious proof of your unacquaintance with the Catholic doctrine, particularly with Bellarmine's Treatise concerning images,) that, supposing the Church of Rome to have been drowned in idolatry during the eight hundred years preceding the Reformation, yet "the Church of Christ is not confined within the limits of the Church of Rome." Acting in the character in which you have placed me, that of Mr. Ward's defender, I prove to you in my dissertation, that the Christians of the East and of the West, of the North and of the South, had no other tenets respecting the articles in question, images, during all those eight hundred years, than the Church of

* Homil. on Idolatry, part iii.

† Homil. on Spirit, &c.

the diocese of Rome itself had, and I remind you of the unlimited nature of the charge of "damnable idolatry," contained in the Homilies; this being brought against "all sects and degrees of men, women, and children of whole Christendom;" nay, as it is elsewhere expressed, "against all the world." Being foiled on this side, you turn to the other, and assure us that "a Church does not cease to be a Church by becoming corrupt; a true Church and a pure Church not being synonymous terms." But this I prove to be an utter misstatement of the case: the real question being, according to the terms of the Homilies, whether that can be the *true Church of Christ*, which "is drowned in the pit of damnable idolatry;" or, to use your own terms, "whether that can be the elect and faithful people," the depository of God's spirit, and sacred orders, the whole collection of which is "drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other crimes the most detestable of God, and the most damnable to men?"

The review of this charge of idolatry against the Catholic Church, led Ward back to his former controversy. Accordingly he has dwelt upon the inconsistency and folly of Protestants deriving their priesthood, and even their very Christianity, from notorious idolaters; repeating, after your controvertist Sutcliffe: "Antichrist cannot ordain priests in the Church of Christ." To this you answer, from some of our divines, that the schism, or heresy, of the ordaining prelate does not vitiate the orders conferred by him. This, Sir, I admit to be true, provided he retains the due matter and form of the respective orders, and provided he intends to do what the Catholic Church does, and would have him do on such occasions. I show, however, that the latter is not to be presumed with respect to downright and "damnable idolaters:" and, by the same rule, I argue that those prelates who rejected the Sacrifice of the New Law, and who held the sacrament to be nothing else but a mere administration of bread and wine, cannot be supposed to have ordained priests for the characteristical office of their order, that of offering up this sacrifice. I point out the momentous consequences that follow from this principle, and likewise from another of first rate importance, which you have totally overlooked. In a word, I prove, that, though Holy Orders themselves could have been transmitted through these eight centuries of dark idolatry, which the homily and you speak of with so much horror, yet that the *divine mission*, or jurisdiction *requisite* for the *exercise of them*

must have become utterly *extinct;* inasmuch as this is lost not only by apostacy and idolatry, but also by heresy, schism, excommunication, or even suspension. Following up this principle, I cannot help showing, at length, that, though Barlow had transmitted the episcopal orders of our Church, it was utterly impossible for him to transmit its jurisdiction ; as likewise I remark on the blundering accounts which you and Burnet give of this transaction. According to these it appears that *Barlow confirmed Parker,** and, eight days afterwards, *Parker confirmed Barlow ;*† that is to say, the father begat the son, and the son begat the father! But I have done with this matter, having already said a great deal more concerning it than I intended to say.

Such, sir, is an imperfect sketch of the letter which I had prepared, and was upon the point of sending to the press, in vindication of myself from your indignant and unmerited attack upon me. But I have considered, 1st, that such a letter would swell the present work to a disproportionate size ; 2dly, that the subject of it is of a nature so peculiarly irritating, that it is hardly possible to treat of it at length without giving great and wide-extended offence ; 3dly, that it is more for the credit and advantage of our Church that the established clergy should stand upon the apostolical succession, and defend their orders, than that they should contemptuously spurn at them, as the greater part of their eminent writers do in the present age ; 4thly, that the line of controversy which I have hitherto invariably followed upon this subject, has been directed against the low church latitudinarians of the latter class, and not against the few remaining high churchmen of the former description. Upon the two last of these observations I must explain myself. It is then evidently for the credit and advantage of the Catholic clergy, that you, Gentlemen of the Establishment, should claim a succession from the apostles, through our Church ; because thus you cannot pretend to be priests and bishops without allowing us to be priests and bishops also. Hence we have only

* "None coming (to Bow Church,) to object against the election, (of Parker,) they, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, *confirmed it* in the usual manner, (viz. Dec. 9.) On the 17th of December, Parker was consecrated."—Burnet's Hist. Reform., b. iii., p. 403.

† "Barlow was only a bishop elect, (when he was appointed to consecrate Parker,) but not confirmed."—Dr. Elrington, p. 51. Parker being consecrated, "afterwards he consecrated Grindal, Cox, &c., and *confirmed Barlow* and Scory."—Ibid. p. 109.

to refer the Lord Redesdales and the Musgraves to you, for a refutation of their objections against our hierarchy. Accordingly, it is seen, that when a Friar Kirwan or any other dissipated and loose priest, who is desirous of expatiating in freer fields of belief and practice than our Church allows, apostatizes, he is uniformly admitted into your ministry without any other ceremony than that of abjuring his faith,* while dissenting ministers of the first distinction who enter into your Church, have never, since the reign of Charles II., been permitted to officiate in it without re-ordination.

To speak now of what I call my own line of controversy upon this subject. In case, sir, you have dipt into my History of Winchester, and the copious dispute which grew out of it between Dr. Sturges, Chancellor of that diocese, &c., and myself, in consequence of my stating that his patron, the celebrated Bishop Hoadly, "had undermined the Church of which he was a prelate,"† you must be informed that one point, which was most warmly contested between us, related to the establishment and continuation of ministers in the Church of Christ. My respectable opponent professed to follow the system of our former common friend, the celebrated Dr. Thomas Balguy, Archdeacon of the diocese, to whose moderation it was certainly owing that he did not become Bishop of Gloucester, and probably also Archbishop of Canterbury. So great was the authority of the latter in the Established Church, that Dr. Sturges, speaking of the very point in question, says of him: "Dr. Balguy has treated this subject with a precision of thought and a correctness of reasoning almost peculiar to the author,"‡ and that Dr. Hey, Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, thus recommends him in his public lectures: "As I distrust my own conclusions more than I do his (Dr. Balguy,) if, upon consideration, you do not judge that they are reconcilable, I must exhort you to confide in him rather than in me."§ I must add, that the several published discourses of this dignitary, were

* This Capuchin Friar, who rose to the dignity of a Dean in the Established Church, has left standing evidence of his real belief, and of his motive for professing one contrary to it, in a remarkable sermon which he preached and published in London a little before his change.

† Hist. of Winch., Vol. II., p. 34, first edit.—See also Reflect. on Popery by the Rev. J. Sturges, LL. D., &c., and Letters to a Prebendary.

‡ Reflect. on Popery, p. 22.—See also Dr. Sturges' Consideration on the Establishment, in Letters to the Bishop of London.

§ Lectures in Divinity, delivered in the University of Cambridge, by James Hey, D. D., as Norrisian Professor, Vol. II., p. 104.

delivered in charges to the Clergy of the Diocese of Winchester, or preached at the consecration of the most eminent prelates and primates of his communion, that they are dedicated to his present Majesty, and that they never have been controverted by any writer except myself.* I mention these circumstances to show the high authority of this divine, and to excuse myself from the task of quoting the doctrine of several other modern divines of inferior talents, though of equal dignity. His definition of a Church is this: "It is a number of persons agreeing to unite together for the performance of religious duties." According to this, as I have elsewhere shown, there is no need of Christ's institution to form a Church; and we may with as much propriety speak of "the church of Diana of Ephesus," or "of Venus of Paphos," as "of the Church of England." Proceeding to show the origin of ministers, and of a liturgy, he never so much as thinks of the apostles, or of Christ, but argues, that "It is highly expedient, if not absolutely necessary, that the offices of religion should be committed to some certain persons, and regulated in some certain manner; but *to whom these offices are to be committed*, and in *what manner performed*, *the society itself must judge*, or appoint others to judge for them. We have here," he adds, "the first sketch of what may be called church authority."† Thus you see, that this learned and eminent dignitary of the establishment is not quite sure that there ought to be any ministers of religion at all; but if there must be such, he is entirely convinced, that, so far from needing an apostolical succession, or stated form of ordination or worship, the society itself has a right to determine what sort of persons these shall be, namely, whether bishops or presbyters, or occasional preachers; whether they shall be priests or priestesses, and whether these offices shall be conferred by the town crier with his bell, or in any other way, and whether the service of religion itself shall consist in praying, preaching, the sacraments, &c., or in shouting and jumping, according to the form of worship observed by the Welsh Methodists.

* Dr. Balguy was perfectly consistent with himself when he answered a question which I put to him at Winchester, in the presence of the late Lord Bristol, Bishop of Derry, &c., that in "case he had been made Archbishop, and an avowed unbaptized Jew had been directed to him by the king to be consecrated bishop of an English see, he would certainly have performed the ceremony."

† See Discourses, &c., by Thomas Balguy, D.D., Archdeacon, &c., printed by Davies, Holborn, 1785. See also his Sermons on the Consecration of Archbishop Moore and Bishop Hurd.

Such, sir, is the latitudinarian system concerning orders, to say nothing of the other branches of it, which I long combated in opposition to the most eminent divines and dignitaries of the establishment. Yet, though the controversy was so public as to find its way into the Houses of Parliament, yet every Protestant of note, as well of the clergy as the laity, whom I knew, or could hear of, except the late Bishop Horseley, declared in favour of my chief opponent, Dr. Sturges, and, of course, in opposition to your system of regular succession, as well as to me.* It is possible, sir, that you and your brethren in Ireland, may not have arrived at the philosophic refinement, which, I have said, is so common in England; and that you may, in the sincerity of your heart, have pointed all that train of arguments with which you have thundered upon poor Ward and me. In this case I expect you will ask how members of the establishment could possibly deviate so widely from its primitive doctrine, as my antagonists are proved to have done. I answer this question in the words of the learned Professor of Divinity cited above: "The foundation of all this is *a tacit reformation*, which has taken place in the Church of late years."† Dr. Balguy himself, though the chief stickler against those who petitioned Parliament for an alteration in the articles,

* Amongst those illustrious personages who declared in favour of Dr. Sturges and his writings, was the late Lord Chancellor Rosslyn, speaking from the woolsack, July 10, 1800.

† Dr. Hey's Lectures, Vol. II., p. 48.—The intelligent Overton asserts that, in virtue of charges which he refers to, of certain prelates now living, the most celebrated for the vigour of their orthodoxy, "an attendance at these Lectures is, in many cases, necessary as a qualification for orders."—True Churchman ascertained, p. 24. It may not be amiss to observe, that the celebrated professor describes this tacit Reformation as now taking in Socinianism itself. The following are specimens of his public lectures concerning it. "We and Socinians differ only about what we do not understand. If we allow one another the use of expressions at will, (and what great matter can there be in what may be almost called unmeaning expressions,) we need never be upon our guard against each other."—Lect., Vol. II., p. 41. "If the Dissenters join us, all they need do is to use, or perhaps be present while we use, a few unmeaning words," (those professing a belief in the blessed Trinity, and the incarnation of the Son of God.) "So long as we clearly maintain the Unity of God, why need others scruple at a few unmeaning sounds, merely because they seem to interfere with it?"—Vol. II., p. 260. Among the numerous expedients which have been devised for justifying a solemn oath and subscription to certain articles of religion which the swearer utterly disbelieves, is that of Dr. Hey, who maintains that the words in which they are conceived bear a different meaning from what they did formerly. This he exemplified by referring to the statutes of certain colleges, which, I presume, are equally sworn to with the articles. Concerning these he says: "The clause *I will say so many masses for the soul of Henry VI.*, may come to mean: *I will perform the religious duties required of me by those who have authority.*"—Vol. II., p. 63.

&c., some years ago, yet expressly tells us: "I am far from wishing to discourage the clergy of the Established Church from thinking for themselves, or from speaking what they think, or even from writing, where the importance of the occasion may seem to demand it; I only contend that men ought not to attack the Church from those very pulpits in which they were placed for her defence."* He then goes on to insist upon the necessity of keeping up an *appearance of uniformity of doctrine;* which, in other words, is the necessity of deceiving the people, by teaching a doctrine, in matters of salvation, which frequently is directly contrary to the preacher's own conviction of the truth. The master both of Dr. Balguy and Dr. Sturges, the renowned Dr. Hoadly, Bishop of Winchester, in a sermon which he preached before the late King, still more expressly inculcates this system of religious dissimulation. He says: "Religious reflection is not the humour of the times, nor can men of any sort be brought to examine their own opinions and popular fashions. We must, therefore, wait till our people are in a better temper, gently and gradually correcting their foolish and erroneous notions and habits: but still taking care *not to offend them with unreasonable truths:* nor to *throw in more light* than the weak optics of men, so long used to sit in darkness, are able to bear."† I have supposed, sir, that you and your brethren in Ireland hold this tacit Reformation in abhorrence; and yet from a particular circumstance which struck me the other day, when I visited your superb library of Trinity College, I am not without some suspicion that it may have found its way amongst you also. Viewing the busts which go round the gallery, I observed one which, from the freshness of the marble, I judged must have been very lately placed there, and, of course, should suppose, sir, with your concurrence, as senior fellow. Impatient to learn what new worthy had been preferred to keep company with the Bacons, the Ushers, the Swifts, and other eminent defenders of the Established Church, I hastened to the figure and found it inscribed with the name of Dr. Clayton, Bishop of Clogher, namely, of that very bishop who so loudly called upon his brethren in Parliament to "amend what," he said, "they knew to be amiss," asserting that "no two thinking men ever agreed exactly in their opinion, not only with regard to all the

* Discourses, p. 20.

† See this quoted by Archdeacon Blackburn, Confessional, p. 376.

articles, but not even with regard to any one of them."* However, as it is possible that this suspicion may be ill grounded, as far as you, sir, are concerned, and that you may resolve upon breaking another lance with me, under the pretence of attacking Ward, I hope, in this case, that you will give me credit for my past defence of the Establishment against her own most favoured sons, and that you will join with me in heartily reprobating the sentiments and conduct, not only of your Patriarchs, Cranmer, Barlow, Grindal, &c., with all the foreign Protestants, but also the publicly avowed opinions of so large and respectable a proportion of your modern brethren. I have reason, indeed, to think, they will not thank you for bringing this discussion forward, as I am witness to the pains they took seven years ago to suppress it: but that is a business in which, of course, I can have no vote. In the mean time I have the honour to remain,

Rev. Sir,

Yours, &c.

†JOHN MILNER.

Wolverhampton, Dec. 12, 1808.

III.

(Extract from Burnet's Exposition of the Twenty-third Article.)

"I come in the next place to consider the second part of this article, which is the definition here given of those that are lawfully called and sent: this is put in very general words, far from that magisterial stiffness in which some have taken upon them to dictate in this matter. The article does not resolve this into any particular constitution, but leaves the matter open and at large for such accidents as had happened, and such as might still happen. They who drew it had the state of the different churches before their eyes, that had been differently reformed; and although their own had been less forced to go out of the beaten path, than any other, yet they knew that all things among themselves had not gone according to those rules that ought to be sacred in regular times; necessity has no law, and is a law to itself.

"This is the difference between those things that are the means of salvation, and the precepts that are only necessary because they

* Ibid. p. 248.

are commanded. Those things which are the means, such as faith, repentance and new obedience, are indispensable; they oblige all men and at all times alike; because they have a natural influence on us, to make us fit and capable subjects of the mercy of God; but such things as are necessary only by a command of God, and not by virtue of any real efficiency which they have to reform our natures, do indeed oblige us to seek for them, and to use all our endeavours to have them. But as they of themselves are not necessary in the same order with the first, so much less are all those methods necessary in which we may come at the regular use of them. This distinction shall be more fully enlarged on when the sacraments are treated of. But to the matter in hand. That which is simply necessary, as a mean to preserve the order and union of the body of Christians, and to maintain the reverence due to holy things, is, that no man enter upon any part of the holy ministry, without he be chosen and called to it by such as have an authority so to do; that, I say, is fixed by the article; but men are left more at liberty as to their thoughts concerning the subject of this lawful authority.

"That which we believe to be *lawful authority*, is that rule which the body of the pastors, or bishops and clergy of a church shall settle, being met in a body under the due respect to the powers that God shall set over them; rules thus made, being in nothing contrary to the word of God, and duly executed by the particular persons to whom that care belongs, are certainly the *lawful authority*. Those are the pastors of the church, to whom the care and watching over the souls of the people is committed, and the prince, or supreme power comprehends virtually the whole body of the people in him; since, according to the constitution of the civil government, the wills of the people are understood to be concluded by the supreme, and such as are the subject of the legislative authority. When a church is in a state of persecution, under those who have the civil authority over her, then the *people* who receive the faith, and give both protection and encouragement to those that labour over them, are to be considered as the body that is governed by them. The natural effect of such a state of things, is to satisfy the people in all that is done to carry along their consent with it, and to consult much with them in it. This does not only arise out of a necessary regard to their present circumstances, but from the rules given in the Gospel, of not ruling as the kings

of the several nations did; nor *lording* it, or carrying it with a high authority over *God's heritage*, (which may be also rendered over their several lots or portions.) But when the church is under the protection of a christian magistrate, then he comes to be in the stead of the whole people; for they are concluded in and by him: he gives the protection and encouragement, and therefore great regard is due to him, in the exercise of his lawful authority, in which he has a great share, as shall be explained in its proper place. Here then we think this authority is rightly lodged, and set on its proper basis.

"And in this we are confirmed, because by the decrees of the first general councils, the concerns of every province were to be settled in the province itself; and it so continued until the usurpation of the papacy broke in every where, and disordered the constitution. Through the whole Roman communion, the chief jurisdiction is now in the Pope; only princes have laid checks upon the extent of it, and by *appeals* the secular court takes cognizance of all that is done, either by the Pope or the clergy. This we are sure is the effect of usurpation and tyranny; yet since this authority is in fact so settled, we do not pretend to annul the acts of that power, nor the missions, nor orders given in that church; because there is among them an order *in fact*, though not as it ought to be *in right*. On the other hand, when the body of the clergy comes to be so corrupted, that nothing can be trusted to the regular decisions of any synod or meeting, called according to their constitution, then if the prince shall select a peculiar number, and commit to their care the examining and reforming both of doctrine and worship, and shall give the legal sanction to what they shall offer to him; we must confess that such a method as this runs contrary to established rules; and that therefore it ought to be very seldom put in practice, and never, except when the greatness of the occasion will balance this irregularity that is in it. But still here there is an authority both in *fact* and *right*, for if the magistrate has power to make laws in sacred matters, he may order those to be prepared by whom and as he pleases.

"Finally, if a company of Christians find the public worship where they live to be so defiled that they cannot with a good conscience join in it; and if they do not know of any place to which they can conveniently go, where they may worship God purely and in a regular way; if, I say, such a body finding some that

have been ordained, though to the lower functions, should submit itself entirely to their conduct; or finding none of those, should by a common consent desire some of their own number to minister to them in holy things, and should upon that beginning grow up to a regulated constitution, though we are very sure that this is quite out of all rule, and could not be done without a very great sin, unless the necessity were great and apparent; yet if the necessity is real and not feigned, this is not condemned or annulled by the article; for when this grows to a constitution, and when it was begun by the consent of a body, who are supposed to have an authority in such an extraordinary case, whatever some hotter spirits may have thought of this since that time; yet we are very sure that not only those who penned the articles, but the body of this church for above half an age after, did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the foreign churches so constituted, to be true churches, as to all the essentials of a church, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state. And therefore the general words in which this part of the article is framed, seem to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them."*

(He then illustrates his theory by a reference to Jewish history, in which usurpers of the high priesthood, especially Caiphas, were acknowledged as ministers of God, whose ministrations, although unlawful, were not annulled. So also Frumentius preached to the Indians before he was made a priest and bishop by Athanasius. The king of the Iberians converted his subjects before he had received baptism himself.)

Burnet then continues:

"These were regular practices; but, if it should happen that princes or states should take up such a jealousy of their own authority, and should apprehend that the suffering of their subjects to go elsewhere for regular ordinations, might bring them under some dependence on those that had ordained them, and give them such influence over them, that the prince of such a neighbouring and regular church should by such ordinations have so many creatures, spies, or instruments in their own dominions; and if upon other political reasons, they had just cause of being jealous of that, and should thereupon hinder any such thing in

* Burnet's Exposition. London, 1819; pp. 257–259.

that case, neither our (English) reformers nor their successors, for near eighty years after those articles were published, did ever question the constitution of such churches."

IV.

An Act concerning the Consecration of a Bishop, made the twenty-fifth of Hen. *VIII.*

Cap. 20. Sect. 5.

Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, That whensoever any such presentment or nomination shall be made by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, by virtue and authority of this act, and according to the tenor of the same: That then every Archbishop and Bishop, into whose hands any such presentment and nomination shall be directed, shall with all speed and celerity, invest and consecrate the person nominate and presented by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, to the office and dignity that such person shall be so presented unto, and give and use to him pall, and all other benedictions, ceremonies and things requisite for the same, without suing, procuring or obtaining hereafter any bulls, or other things at the see of *Rome*, for any such office or dignity in that behalf. And then after he hath made such oath and fealty duly to the King's Majesty, his heirs and successors, as shall be limited for the same, the King's Highness, by his Letters Patents under his great seal, shall signify the said election to one Archbishop, and two other Bishops, or else to four Bishops within this realm, or within any other the King's dominions, to be assigned by the King's Highness, his heirs or successors, requiring and commanding the said Archbishop and Bishops with all speed and celerity, to confirm the said election, and to invest and consecrate the said person so elected to the office and dignity that he is elected unto, and to give and use to him such pall, benedictions, ceremonies, and all other things requisite for the same, without suing, procuring or obtaining any bulls, briefs, or other things at the said see of *Rome*, or by the authority thereof in any behalf.

And be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, That every person and persons being hereafter chosen, elected, nominate, presented, invested, and consecrated to the dignity or office of any

Archbishop or Bishop within this realm, or within any other the King's dominions, according to the form, tenor, and effect of this present act, and suing their temporalties, out of the King's hands, his heirs or successors, as hath been accustomed, and making a corporal oath to the King's Highness, and to none other, in form as is afore rehearsed, shall and may from henceforth be enthronised or installed, as the case shall require, and shall have and take their only restitution out of the King's hands of all the possessions and profits spiritual and temporal belonging to the said Archbishoprick or Bishoprick whereunto they shall be so elected or presented, and shall be obeyed in all manner of things, according to the name, title, degree, and dignity that they shall be so chosen or presented unto, and do and execute in every thing and things touching the same, as any Archbishop or Bishop of this realm without offending of the prerogative royal of the Crown and the laws and customs of this realm might at any time heretofore do.

And be it farther enacted by the authority aforesaid, That if the Prior and Convent of any Monastery, or Dean and Chapter of any cathedral Church where the see of an Archbishop or Bishop is within any the King's dominions, after such license, as is afore rehearsed, shall be delivered to them, proceed not to election, and signifie the same according to the tenor of this Act within the space of twenty days next after such license shall come to their hands: Or else if any Archbishop or Bishop within any the King's dominions, after any such election, nomination or presentation shall be signified unto them by the King's Letters Patents, shall refuse, and do not confirm, invest and consecrate with all due circumstance, as is aforesaid, every such person as shall be so elected, nominated, or presented, and to them signified, as is above mentioned, within twenty days next after the King's Letters Patents of such signification or presentation shall come to their hands: Or else if any of them, or any other person or persons, admit, maintain, allow, obey, do, or execute any censures, excommunications, interdictions, inhibitions, or any other process or act of what nature, name, or quality soever it be to the contrary, or let of due execution of this act, That then every—person—so offending and doing contrary to this Act—shall run in the dangers, pains and penalties of the estatute of Provision and *Præmunire*, made in the five and twentieth year of the reign of King *Edward III.*, and in the sixteenth year of King *Richard II.*

V.

Statutes relating to the Consecration of Bishops under Edward *the* Sixth, *in the Parliaments of* 1547, 1549 *and* 1552.

1. Edward the Sixth, c. 2.

Forasmuch as the election of Archbishops and Bishops by the Deans and Chapters—be as well to the long delay as to the great costs and charges, &c. Be it enacted that the King may, by his Letters Patent, at all times, when any Archbishoprick or Bishoprick is void, confer the same to any person whom the King shall think meet, the which collation so by the King's Letters Patent made—shall stand, to all intents, constructions, and purposes to as much and the same effect as though Congé d'Elire had been given, the election duly made, and the same confirmed. And thereupon the said person to whom the said Archbishoprick, or Bishoprick, or Suffraganship is so conferred, collated, or given, may be consecrated, and sue his livery, or ouster les mains, and do other things as well as if the said Ceremonies and Elections had been done and made.

VI.

An Act in the Year 1549, *to order the drawing up a new Form of Ordination.*

3. Edw. 6, c. 2.

Such form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and other Ministers of the Church, as by six Prelates, and six other men of this realm learned in God's law, by the King to be appointed and assigned, or by the most number of them shall be devised for that purpose, and set forth under the Great Seal before the first of April next coming, shall be lawfully exercised and used, and none other.

VII.

An Act in 1552, *to annex the Ordinal to the Book of Common Prayer.*

Because there hath risen in the use and exercise of the aforesaid common service in the Church, heretofore set forth, divers

doubts for the fashion and manner of the ministration of the same, rather by the curiosity of the minister and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause: Therefore as well for the more plain and manifest explanation thereof, as for the more perfection of the said order or common service, in some places where it is necessary to make the same Prayer and fashion of service more earnest and fit to stir christian people to the true honouring of Almighty God, The King's most excellent Majesty, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same hath caused the aforesaid order of common service, entituled, *The Book of Common Prayer*, to be faithfully and godly perused, explained and made fully perfect, and by the aforesaid authority hath annexed and joyned it, so explained and perfected, to this present Statute; Adding also a form and manner of making and consecrating of Archbishops, Bishops, Priests and Deacons to be of like force, authority and value, as the same like aforesaid Book, entituled, *The Book of Common Prayer* was before, and to be accepted, received, used, and esteemed in like sort and manner, and with the same clauses of provisions and exceptions to all intents, constructions and purposes, as by the Act of Parliament made in the second year of the King's Majesty's Reign, was ordained, limited, expressed, and appointed for the uniformity of service, and administration of the Sacraments throughout the realm, upon such several pains, as in the said Act of Parliament is expressed: And the said former Act to stand in full force and strength, to all intents and constructions, and to be applied, practised, and put in ure, to and for the establishing of *the Book of Common Prayer*, now explained and hereunto annexed, and also the said form of making Archbishops, Bishops, or Priests and Deacons hereunto annexed, as it was for the former Book.

VIII.

An Acte for the Repeele of certayne Statutes made in the time of the Raigne of Kinge Edwarde *the Syxthe.*

Exhibita est Regie Mati in Parliamento predicto Billa quedam formam Actus in se continens.

5. Forasmuche as by dyvers and severall Actes hereafter mentioned, as well the Dyvine Service and goodde Administracon of

the Sacramentes as dyvers other matters of Religion whiche we and our Forefathers founde in this Churche of Englande, to us lefte by thaucthoritie of the Catholyke Churche, partly bee altered and in some parte taken from us, and in place thereof newe things imagined and set forthe by the sayd Actes, suche as a fewe of singularitie have of them selfes devised, wherof hathe ensewed amongest us in verie shorte time numbers of dyvers and straung opinions and diversitees of Sects, and thereby growen greate unquietnes and muche discorde, to the great disturbance of the Comon Wealthe of this Realme, and in very shorte time lyke to growe to extreame perill and utter confusion of the same, onles some remedye bee in that behalf provided; which thing all true, loving and obedient subjects ought and are bounden to foresee and provide to thuttermost of their power.

In consideracon wherof, Be it enactedd and established by the Queene's Highness, the Lordes Spirituall and Temporall, and the Commons in this same present Parliament assembled, and by thaucthoritee of the same, That an Acte made in the Parliament begoane at *Westminister* the fourthe daye of *November* in the first yere of the Raigne of the late King *Edwarde* the Syxthe, and from thens continued till the xxiiij daye of *December* then next ensuing; that is to saye, in the first Session of the same Parliament, intituled, An Acte againste cuche parsons as shoulde unreverentlye speake againste the Sacrament of the Bodye and Bloude of Christ, commonlye called The Sacrament of the Alter, and for the receyving thereof in bothe kindes; And also one other Acte in the same Session, which is intituled, An Acte for theleccon of Bishoppes, and what Seales and Stiles they and other Spirituall parsons exercising jurisdiccon ecclesiasticall shoulde use. And also one other Acte made in one other Session of the said Parliament, holden upon prorogation at Westminister, the fourthe daye of *November*, in the seconde yere of the Raigne of the sayd late King *Edwarde* the Syxthe, and ther continued and kepte to the xiiij daye of *Marche*, in the third yere of the sayd late Kinge's Raigne, intituled, An Acte for the Uniformitie of Service and administracon of the Sacraments throughout the Realme. And also one other Acte, made in the Session last before named, which is intituled, An Acte to take awaye all positive Lawes made against the Marriage of Priestes. And also one other Acte, made in one other Session of the sayd Parliament, holden upon prorogation at West-

minister, the fourthe daye of *November*, in the third yere of the Raigne of the sayd late King *Edwarde* the Syxthe, and ther continued and kepte to the first daye of *Februarie*, in the fourthe yere of his Raigne, intituled, An Acte for thabolishing and putting awaye of the dyvers Bookes and Images. And also one other Acte, made in the same Session last before mentioned, intituled, An Acte made for thordering of the ecclesiasticall Ministers. And also one other Acte, made in one other Session of the sayd Parliament, holden upon prorogacon at *Westminister*, the xxiij daye of *Januarie*, in the fifthe yere of the Raigne of sayd late King *Edwarde* the Syxthe, and ther continued and kepte till the xvth daye of *Aprill*, in the Syxthe yere of the Raigne of the sayd late King, intituled, An Acte for the Uniformitie of Common Prayour and thadministracon of the Sacramentes. And one other Acte, made in the same last Session, intituled, An Acte for the keeping of Holye Dayes and Fastings Dayes. And one other Acte, made in the Session last recited, intituled, An Act made for the declaration of a Statute made for the Marriage of Priestes and for the legitimacon of their children. And everye clause, sentence, braunche, article and articles mentioned, expressed or contained in the sayd Estatutes, and in everye of them, shall bee fromhensforthe utterly repelled, voide, adnichilate and of none effecte, to all purposes, construccons and intentes, any thing or things contained or specifiedd in the sayd Estatutes, or any of them, to the contrairie in any wise notwithstanding.

And be it furthere enacted by thaucthoritie aforesaid, That all suche Dyvine Service and Administration of Sacraments as were most commonly used in the Realme of Englande in the last yere of the Raigne of our late Sovereine Lorde King *Henrie* theight, shall bee, from and after the xxth daye of *December*, in this presente yere of our Lorde God One thousande five hundrethe fiftie and three, used and frequented throughe the hole Realme of Englande and all other the Queen's Majestie's Dominions, and that no other kinde nor order of Dyvine Service nor Administratyon of Sacramentes bee, after the sayd xxth daye of *December*, used or ministredd in any other manner, fourme or degree within the sayd Realme of England or other Queen's Dominions, then was most commonly used, ministredd and frequented in the said last yere of the Raigne of the sayd late King *Henrie* the Eight. And be it further enacted, by the authoritie aforesaid, That no person shall

bee empeached or molested in bodye or gooddes for using heretofore or until the sayd xxth daye of *December* the Dyvine Service mentioned in the sayd Actes or any of them, nor for the using of the Olde Dyvine Service and Administration of Sacramentes in suche manner and fourme as was used in the Churche of Englande before the making of any of the sayd Actes.

Cui quidem Bille perlecte et ad plenum intellecte per dicam Donam. Reginam, ex aucthoritate Parliamenti predicti. Sic Responsum est

La Reigne le veult.

This is a true Copy, from the original Record remaining in the Chapel of the Rolls, having been examined.

John Kipling.

IX.

An Act of Parliament, made in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, (1559) *to re-establish the Book of Common Prayer, drawn up under Edward VI.*

Whereas at the death of our late Sovereign Lord, King Edward VI., there remained one uniform order of Common Service and Prayer, and of the administration of Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, which was set forth in one book, entituled, *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, in the Church of* England, authorized by Act of Parliament holden in the fifth and sixth years of our said late Sovereign Lord, King *Edward VI.*, entituled, *An Act for the Uniformity of Common-Prayer, and the Administration of the Sacraments;* the which was repealed and taken away by Act of Parliament in the first year of the reign of our late Sovereign Lady Queen *Mary*, to the great decay of the due honour of God, and discomfort to the professors of the truth of Christ's Religion.

Be it therefore enacted by the authority of this present Parliament, That the said estatute of repeal, and every thing therein contained, only concerning the said book, and the service and administration of the Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies contained

or appointed in, or by the said book, shall be void and of none effect, from and after the Feast of the Nativity of Saint *John Baptist*, next coming, And that the said book with the order of service, and of the administration of Sacraments, Rites and Ceremonies, with the alterations and additions therein added and appointed by this estatute, shall stand and be from and after the said Feast of the Nativity of Saint *John Baptist*, in full force and effect, according to the tenor and effect of this estatute, any thing in the foresaid estatute of repeal to the contrary notwithstanding.

And further be it enacted by the Queen's Highness, with the assent of the Lords and Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that all and singular Ministers—shall from and after the Feast of the Nativity of Saint *John Baptist* next coming, be bounden to say and use the Mattens, Even-song, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and administration of each of the Sacraments, and all the common and open prayer, in such order and form as is mentioned in the said book so authorized by Parliament, in the said fifth and sixth years of the reign of King *Edward VI.*, with one alteration or addition of certain lessons to be used on every *Sunday* in the year, and the form of the Litany altered and corrected, and two sentences only added in the delivery of the Sacrament to the communicants, and none other, or otherwise.

X.

Queen Elizabeth's *second Letters Patent to proceed to the Confirmation and Consecration of* Parker.

Regina, &c. Reverendis in Christo patribus, Antonio Landav. episcopo, Willielmo Barloo quondam Bathon. episcopo, nunc Cicest. electo, Johanni Scorye quondam Cicestr. episcopo, nunc Herefordensi, Mil. Coverdall quondam Exoniensi episcopo, Ricardo Bedfordensi, Johanni Thetfordensi episcopis suffraganeis, Johanni Bale Osserensi episcopo, salutem.

Cum, vacante nuper sede archiepiscopali Cantuariensi per mortem naturalem D. Reginaldi Pole Cardinalis, ultimi & immediati archiepiscopi & pastoris ejusdem, ad humilem petitionem decani & capituli ecclesiæ nostræ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis, eisdem per literas nostras patentes licentiam concessimus alium sibi eligendi in archiepiscopum & pastorem sedis prædictæ,

ac iidem decanus & capitulum vigore & obtentu licentiæ nostræ prædictæ, dilectum nobis in Christo Mag. Matheum Parker S. Theologiæ professorem, sibi & ecclesiæ prædictæ elegerint in archiepiscopum & pastorem, prout per literas suas patentes sigillo eorum communi sigillatas, nobis inde directas, pleniùs liquet & apparet.

Nos, electionem illam acceptantes, eidem electioni regium nostrum assensum adhibuimus pariter & favorem, & hoc vobis tenore præsentium significamus.

Rogantes, ac in fide & dilectione, quibus nobis tenemini, firmiter præcipiendo mandantes, quatenùs, vos aut ad minùs quatuor vestrûm, eundem Math. Parker in archiepiscopum & pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis prædictæ, sic, ut præfertur, electum, electionemque prædictam confirmare, & eundem Mag. Math. Parker in archiepiscopum & pastorem ecclesiæ prædictæ consecrare, cæteraque omnia & singula peragere, quæ vestro in hac parte incumbunt officio pastorali, juxta formam statutorum in ea parte editorum & provisorum, velitis cum effectu.

Supplementes nihilominùs supremâ auctoritate nostrâ Regiâ, ex mero motu ac certa scientia nostris, si quid aut in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nostrum prædictum per vos fient, aut in vobis, aut in vestrûm aliquo, conditione, statu, facultate vestris ad præmissa perficienda desit aut deerit eorum, quæ per statuta hujus regni, aut per leges ecclesiasticas in hac parte requiruntur, aut necessaria sunt, temporis ratione, & rerum necessitate id postulante. In cujus rei, &c. Teste Regina apud Westmonasterium vi die Decembris.

XI.

Approbation of the preceding Form.

We whose Names that are here under subscribed, think in our Judgments, that by this Commission, in this Form penned as well the Queen's Majesty may lawfully authorize the Persons within named to the effect specified, as that the said Persons may exercise the Act of confirming and consecrating, in the same to them committed.

William May, Henry Harvey,
Rob. Weston, Thomas Yale,
Edward Leeds, Nicholas Bullingham.

XII.

The Confirmation (*) *of* Parker's *Election by the consecrating Bishops.*

In Dei nomine, Amen. Nos Willielmus quondam Bathon. & Wellen. episcopus, nunc electus Cicestrensis, Johan. Scorye quondam Cicestr. episcopus, nunc Herefordensis electus, Milo Coverdale quondam Exon. episcopus, & Johannes Bedfordensis episcopus, Seren. in Christo Principis & Dominæ nostræ D. Elizabethæ Dei Gratiâ, Angliæ, Franciæ & Hiberniæ Reginæ, fidei defensatricis, &c. mediantibus literis suis regiis commissionalibus patent. ad infra scripta commissarii, cum hac clausula, videlicet (unà cum DD. Johan. Thetfordensi suffraganeo, & Joh. Bale Osserensi episcopo) & etiam hac clausula (quatenùs vos aut ad minus quatuor vestrûm, &c.) necnon & hac adjectione (supplentes nihilominus, &c.) specialiter & legitimè deputati in negotio confirmationis electionis de persona venerabilis & eximii viri Mag. Math. Parker, S. Theolog. professoris, in archiepiscopum Cantuariensem electi, factæ & celebrate rite & legitimè procedentes, omnes & singulos oppositores qui contra dictam electionem seu formam ejusdem, aut personam electam dicere, excipere, vel opponere voluerint, ad comparendum coram nobis, istis die, horis, & loco, si sua putaverint interesse) contra dictam electionem, formam ejusdam, aut personam electam in debita juris forma dictur' exceptur' & propositur' legitimè & peremptoriè citatos sæpius, publicè præconizatos, diuque & sufficienter expectatos, & nullo modo comparentes, nec contra dictam electionem, formam ejusdem, aut personam electam aliquid dicentes, excipientes, vel opponentes, ad petitionem procuratoris, decani & capituli Cantuariensis, pronunciamus contumaces & in pœnam contumaciarum suarum hujusmodi decernimus procedendum fore ad prolationem sententiæ sive decreti finalis in hac causa ferendi ipsorum sic citatorum & non comparentium contumac' in aliquo non obstante—

In Dei nomine, Amen. Auditis, visis & intellectis, ac plenariè & maturè discussis per nos Will. quondam Bath & Well. episcopum nunc Cicestrensem electum, Joh. Scorye quondam Cicestr. episcopum, nunc electum Hereford. Milonem Coverdale quondam Exoniens. episcopum, & Johan. Bedford. episcopum, Seren. in Christo Principis & Dom. nostræ D. Elizabethæ Dei Gratiâ Angl.

* Parker was confirmed by Proxy, which he appointed the 7th of December. His Proxies were Nicholas Bullingham and William May, Dean of St. Paul's.

Franc. & Hibern. Reginæ, fidei defens. &c. mediantibus literis suis regiis commissionalibus patentibus ad infra scripta commissarios, cum hac clausula, videlicet (unà cum DD. Joh. Thetfordensi suffraganeo, & Joh. Bale Osserensi episc.) & etiam hac clausula (Quatenus vos, aut ad minus quatuor vestrûm, &c.) necnon & hac adjectione (Supplentes nihilominùs, &c.) specialiter & legitimè deputatos, meritis & circumstantiis cujusdam causæ sive negotii confirmationis electionis de persona vener. & eximii viri Mag. Math. Parker, S. Theologiæ professoris in Archiepisc. & pastorem ecclesiæ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuariensis, per obitum bonæ memoriæ D. Regin. Pole ultimi archiepiscopi ibidem, vacantis, electi, factæ & celebratæ, quod coram nobis aliquandiu vertebatur, & in presenti vertitur & pendet indeciss', rimato primitùs per nos toto & integro processu coram nobis in dicto negotio habito & facto, atque diligenter recensito, servatisque per nos de jure & statutis hujus regni servandis ad nostri decreti finalis sive sententiæ diffinitivæ conformationis in hujusmodi negotio ferendæ prolationem, sic duximus procedendum, & procedimus in hunc qui sequitur modum: Quia per acta exhibita, producta & probato coram nobis in hujusmodi confirmationis negotio, comperimus, & luculenter invenimus electionem ipsam per decanum & capitulum ecclesiæ cathedralis & metropoliticæ Christi Cantuar. prædictæ de præfato vener. & eximio viro Mag. Math. Parker electo hujusmodi, viro utique provido & discreto, vitâ & moribus meritò commendato, libero & de legitimo matrimonio procreato, atque in ætate legitima & ordine sacerdotali constituto, ritè & legitimè fuisse & esse factam & celebratam, nihilque eidem ven. viro Mag. Math. Parker electo hujusmodi, de ecclesiasticis institutis obviasse, seu obviare, quo minus in archiep. Cantuar. authoritate dictæ Ill. D. N. Regin. meritò debeat confirmari. Idcircò nos Will. nuper Bath. and Well. episcopus, nunc Cicestriensis electus, Johannes Scory quondam Cicestrensis episcopus, nunc electus Herefordiensis, Milo Coverdale quondam Exoniensis episc. & Johan. Bedford. episcopus, commissarii regii antedicti, attentis præmissis, & aliis virtut' merit', super quibus præfatus electus Cantuariensis fide digno commendatru testimonio, Christi nomine primitùs invocato, ac ipsum solum Deum oculis nostris præponendo, de & cum concilio jurisperitorum, cum quibus in hac parte communicavimus, prædictam electionem de eodem vener. viro Mag. Math. Parker (ut præfertur) factam & celebratam, suprema authoritate dictæ Ser. D. N. Reginæ

nobis in hac parte commissa, confirmamus; supplentes ex suprema authoritate regia, ex mero principis motu, ac certa scientia nobis delegata, quidquid in hac electione fuerit defectum, tam in hiis quæ juxta mandatum nobis creditum à nobis factum & processum est, aut in nobis, aut aliquorum nostrorum conditione, statu, facultate ad hæc perficienda deest aut deerit; tam etiam eorum quæ per statuta hujus Regni Angliæ, aut per leges ecclesiasticas, in hac parte requisita sunt vel necessaria, prout temporis ratio & rerum præsentium necessitas id postulant, per hanc nostram sententiam diffinitivam, sive hoc nostrum finale decretum, quam, sive quod, ad petitionem partium ita petentium fecimus & promulgamus in his scriptis.

XIII.

The Record of Parker's *Consecration taken out of the Registers of the Church of* Canterbury, *and out of* Corpus Christi College *Library at* Cambridge.

Rituum atque cæremoniarum ordo in consecrando R R. in Chr. patre Matth. Parker, archiepisc. Cant. in Sacello suo apud manerium suum de Lambeth, die Dominico, 17, viz. die mensis Decembris, Ann. Dem. 1559, habit'.

Principio sacellum tapetibus ad orientem adornabatur, solum verò panno rubro insternebatur; mensa quoque sacris peragendis necessaria, tapeto pulvinarique ornata ad orientem sita erat.

Quatuor præterea cathedræ, quatuor episcopis quibus munus consecrandi archiepiscopi delegabatur, ad Austrum Orientalis sacelli partis erant positæ.

Scamnum præterea tapete pulvinaribusque instratum, cui episcopi genibus flexis inniterentur, ante cathedras ponebatur.

Pari quoque modo cathedra scamnunque tapete pulvinarique ornatum archiepiscopo, ad Borealem orientalis ejusdem sacelli partis plagam posita erant.

His rebus ita ordine suo instructis, manè circiter quintam aut sextam per occidentalem portam ingreditur sacellum archiepiscopus toga talari coccinea caputioque indutus, quatuor præcedentibus funalibus, & quatuor comitatus episcopis, qui ejus consecrationi inservirent (verbi gratia) Guill. Barlow olim Bath. & Well. episcopo, nunc *verò ad Citestr. episcopatum electo, Joh. Scory olim

* Exemplar Cantuariense, *nunc electo Cicestrensi.*

Cicestr. episcopo, & nunc* ad Hereford. vocato, Milone Coverdallo olim Exon. episcopo, & Joh.† Hodgskinne Bedfordiæ suffraganeo. Qui omnes postquam sedes sibi paratas ordine singuli suo occupassent, preces continuo matutinæ per Andream Pierson archiepiscopi capellanum clara voce recitabantur; quibus peractis, Joh. Scory (de quo supra diximus) suggestum conscendit, atque inde assumpto sibi in thema, *Seniores ergo qui in vobis sum obsecro consentor, &c.* non ineleganter concionabatur.

Finita concione, egrediuntur simul archiepiscopus reliquique quatuor episcopi sacellum, se ad sacram communionem paraturi: Neque mora, confestim per borealem portam‡ in vestiarium, ad hunc modum vestiti redeunt; archiepiscopus nimirum linteo superpelliceo (quod vocant) induebatur, Cicestrensis electus capâ sericâ ad sacra peragenda paratus utebatur: Cui ministrabant operamque suam præbebant duo archiepiscopi Capellani viz. Nicholas Bullingham Lincolniæ‖ archidiaconus, & Edmundus Gest Cantuariensis§ quoque archidiaconus, capis sericis similiter vestiti. Hereford. electus, & Bedfordiensis suffraganeus linteis superpelliceis induebantur.

Milo verò Coverdallus nonnisi togâ laneâ talari utebatur.

Atque hunc in modum vestiti & instructi ad communionem celebrandam perrexerunt, archiepiscopo genubus flexis ad infimum sacelli gradum sedente.

Finito tandem evangelio, Hereford. electus Bedfordiæ suffraganeus, & Milo Coverdallus (de quibus supra) archiepiscopum coram Cicestrens. electo apud mensam in cathedra¶ sedenti, his verbis adduxerunt. "Rev. in Deo Pater, hunc virum pium pariter atque doctum tibi offerimus atque presentamus, ut archiepiscopus consecratur." Postquam hæc** dixissent proferebatur illicò reginæ diploma sive mandatum pro consecratione archiepiscopi, quo per rev. Thomam Yale legum doctorem perlecto, sacramentum de regio primatu sive suprema ejus authoritate tuenda juxta statuta primo anno regni Seren. Reginæ nostræ Elizabeth†† promulgata, ab eodem archiepiscopo exigebatur, quod cum ille solenniter tactis corporaliter sacris evangeliis, conceptis verbis præstitisset,

* Cant. *nunc Hereford. electo.*
† In Cant. deest *Hodgskinne.*
‡ Fortè *ingressi in vestiarium.* In exempl. eccl. Cant. deest. *in vestiarium.*
§ In Ex. Cant. deest. *archidiaconus.*
‖ Cant. respectivé *archidiaconi.*
¶ Ex. Cant. *sedente.*
** Cant. *dixisset.*
†† Cant. *edita & prom.*

Cicestrensis electus* quædam præfatus, atque populum ad orationem hortatus, ad litanias decantandas choro respondente se accinxit. Quibus finitis, post quæstiones aliquot archiepiscopo per Cicestr. electum propositas, & post orationes & suffragia quædam juxta formam libri† antedicti parliamenti editi apud Deum habita, Cicestriensis, Herefordiensis, suffraganeus Bedfordiensis, & Milo Coverdallus, manibus archiepiscopo impositis:‡ "Accipe (inquiunt Anglicè) Spiritum Sanctum, & gratiam Dei quæ jam per§ impositionem manuum in te est, excitare memento. Non enim timoris sed virtutis, dilectionis & sobrietatis spiritum dedit nobis Deus." His ita dictis, biblia sacra illi in manibus tradiderunt, hujusmodi apud eum verba habentes: "‖In legendo, hortando et docendo vide diligens sis, atque ea meditare assiduè quæ in hisce libris scripta sunt: noli in his segnis esse, quo incrementum, inde proveniens omnibus innotescat, & palàm fiat. Cura quæ ad te ad docendi munus spectant diligenter: hoc enim modo non teipsum solum, sed & reliquos auditores tuos per Jesum Christ. Dom. nostrum salvabis." Postquam hæc dixissent, ad reliqua communionis solemnia pergit Cicestrensis, nullum archiepiscopo tradens pastoralem baculum: cum quo communicabant¶ unà archiepiscopus, et illi episcopi supra nominati; cum aliis etiam nonnullis.

Finitis tandem peractisque sacris, egreditur per borealem** Orientis sacelli partis portam archiepiscopus, quatuor illis comitatus episcopis, qui eum consecraverant, & confestim iisdem ipsis stipatus episcopis, per eandem revertitur portam albo episcopali superpellitio chimeraque (ut vocant) ex nigro serico indutus circa collum verò collare quoddam ex pretiosis pellibus Sabellinis (vulgo *Sables* vocant) consuetum gestabat. Pari quoque modo Cicestrensis & Hereford. suis episcopalibus amictibus, superpellitio†† scilicet et chimera, uterque induebatur. D. Coverdallus vero et Bedfordiæ suffraganeus togis solummodò talaribus utebantur. Pergens deinde occidentalem portam versus archiepiscopus, Thomæ Doyle œconomo, Johanni Baker thesaurario, et Johan. Marche computo rotulario, singulis singulos albos dedit baculos; hoc scilicet modo‡‡ eis muneribus et officiis suis ornans.

* In Cant. desunt hæc verba *quæd. præfatus atque.*
† Meliùs Cant. *authoritate Parl.*
‡ In Ex. Cant. hæc formula Anglicé legitur.
§ Malé leg. *impositionis.*
‖ In Ex. Cant. hæc formula Anglicé legitur.
¶ In Cant. deest. una.
†† In Cant. deest. *scilicet.*
** Meliùs Cant. *orientalis.*
‡‡ Meliùs Cant. *eos.*

His itaque hunc ad modum ordine suo, ut jam ante dicum est, peractis, per occidentalem portam sacellum egreditur archiepiscopus generosioribus quibusque sanguine* ex ejus familia eum præcedentibus, reliquis verò eum à tergo sequentibus.

Acta gestaque hæc erant omnia in presentia reverend.† episcoporum Edmundi Gryndall Lond. episcopi electi, Richardi Cockes Eliensis electi, Edwini Sandes Wigorn. electi, Anthonii Huse armigeri principalis & primarii registrarii dicti archiepiscopoi Thomæ Argall armigeri registrarii‡ Cicestriæ prærogativæ Cantauriensis, Thomæ Willet & Joh. Incent notariorum publicorum, & aliorum§ quoque nonnullorum.

Concordat eum originali in bibliotheca Collegii Corporis Christi apud Cantabrigienses.

Ita testor Matth. Whinn, Notarius Public & Acad. Cant. Registrarius Principalis.

Jan. 8. 1674.

Certificate.

Camb. Jan. 11, 1674.

We whose names are hereunto subscribed, having seen the original, whereof this Writing is a perfect Copy, and considered the Hand, and other Circumstances thereof, are fully persuaded, that it is a true and genuine Record of the Rites and Ceremonies of Archbishop *Parker's* Consecration, and as ancient as the Date it bears. In Witness whereof we have hereunto set our Hands, the Day and Year above written.

Hen. Paman, Orat. Publ.
Hen. More, D. D.
Ra. Widdrington, S. T. D. & D. Marg. P.

C. C. C. C.

We, the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College, in the University of Cambridge, do hereby declare and certify, that this writing, being a narrative of Archbishop Parker's Consecration in Lambeth Chapel, is faithfully transcribed from the original Record in our College Library: and that we are fully satisfied that the said Record is as ancient as the Date it bears, and the occasion to which it doth refer. Nor can we doubt but the plain and

* Cant. &c.
‡ Melius Cant. *curiæ.*
† Cant. in Christo patrum. deest. *episcoporum.*
§ In Cant. deest *quoque.*

evident tokens of antiquity which it carries, will as much satisfy any ingenuous persons who shall have a sight thereof; which therefore we shall readily afford to those who shall repair to the College for that purpose.

John Spencer, D. D., Master of the College.

John Peckover, B. D.	Sam. Beck, B. D.
Erasmus Lane, B. D.	Hen. Gostling, B. D.
Ri. Sheldrake, B. D.	Will. Briggs, M. A.
	John Richer, M. A.

XIV.

In C. C. C. Cambridge, a Parchment Roll is preserved containing the principal events of *Parker's* Life, all said to be written in his own hand. The following is an extract:

1559. 17, Decembr. Ann. 1559. Consecratus sum in Archiepiscopum Cantuarien.

Heu! Heu! Domine Deus in quæ tempora servasti me? Jam veni in profundum aquarum, & tempestas demersit me.

O! Domine, vim patior, responde pro me, & spiritu tuo principali confirma me. Homo enim sum, & exigui temporis & minor, &c.

Da mihi sedium tuarum, &c.

XV.*

Memorial presented to Pope Clement XIth., *by the Congregation of the Holy Office, on behalf of* John Clement Gordon, *who had been Bishop of* Glasgow, *and was desirous of being Re-ordained, as given by* Le Quien. Pièces Justificatives, p. lxix.

Beatissime Pater.

Joannes Clemens Gordon Scotus nuper Romæ ad fidem conversus ad pedes Sanctitatis vestræ humilime provolutus, exponit, quemadmodum Episcopatûs gradum in patriâ obtinuerit, ritu hæreticorum utcumque consecratus. Cum autem hujusmodi conse-

* I take this document from Mr. Evans's Appendix, not having the volume of Le Quien from which he took it. Although some of the details mentioned in it are not accurately related, the statement is substantially the same as that given a century before in the authorities referred to in the body of this work. The misnomer of Keal, for Neal, is apparently a typographical error, which, but for Mr. Evans's remark on the mistake, I should have felt at liberty to alter.

crationem opinetur esse nullam, ob rationem huic supplici Libello annexam, et summoperè desideret ex suo gradu dubio ac suspenso, ad certum statum Ecclesiasticum adscribi, Deoque et Ecclesiæ Catholicæ inservire, ideo

Supplicat reverenter Orator, ut Sanctitas vestra declarare dignetur, hujusmodi ordinationem esse illegitimam et nullam ; atque secum, ut ordines sacros Catholico ritu suscipere queat, dispensare, et Deus, &c.

Motivum, ob quod Anglicanorum Heterodoxorum ordinationes arbitratur Orator, cum plurimâ Catholicorum, imo et heterodoxorum parte, nullo modo validas dici posse.

Ut enim validæ dici possent, non dubiè duntaxat, verum certo constare oporteret, apud prætensos Episcopos Anglos residere verum Episcopatûs Characterem ; legitimam illos accepisse ab Ecclesiâ Catholicâ per successionem aliquam ordinationem, consecrationemque, et denique ab illis Pseudo-Episcopis adhibitum fuisse, ac etiamnum adhiberi essentialem in eorum consecrationibus, formam, materiam, intentionemque. Etenim, si quid ex tribus hisce, nimirum charactere, legitimâ consecratione, formâque, aut intentione desit, consecrationem dici nullam et invalidam cum Theologis omnibus fateri necesse est.

Quod autem primum spectat, fatentur hæretici, illius regionis doctissimi, (utpote lumine veritatis convicti) nullam apud se ordinandi potestatem esse, quæ ab Ecclesia Romano-Catholicâ derivata in eos non sit. Id confitetur ingenuè Bridgesius Pseudo-Episcopus Oxoniensis in Defensione Regiminis, &c., pag. 278. Ecce ejus verba: *Si fratres nostri Papistas tantum Laicos esse velint, erimus nos, et omnes Ministri nostri, meri quoque Laici. Nam qui nos ordinavit Ministros, nisi qui de eorum Ministerio fuerunt ? Nisi forsan a populo Ministros fieri velint.* Quod ultimum negat Ministellus ille. At non est illi assentiendum pro illâ parte, quod Ministerium a Catholicis (ut præ se fert) habuerint, cum nullam successivæ ordinationis rationem afferat. Hâc autem sublatâ, nulla alia Consecrationis apud hæreticos istos extant vestigia, præter Ministerium a populo, vel Principe Laico acceptum. Itaque, si nulla legitima ordinatio Consecratioque Sacerdotalis aut Episcopalis in illos manarit, ab Orthodoxis Romano-Catholicis Episcopis ; igitur et nullum characterem, nullamque habent in se Consecrationem ; atque adeo hanc in alios nequeunt valide conferre. Sed ne solis hâc in re (quod hujus dubii caput est) vi-

deatur Oratur hæreticorum assertionibus inniti, invaliditatem Consecrationum his argumentis ex historiâ depromptis invictè probat.

Constat, nullum Episcopum Catholicum in schismate et veræ Fidei Abjuratione Anglicanâ ad partes transiisse hæreticorum, præter unum Antonium, Kitchin nomine, Episcopum Landaffensem, doctrinâ et scientiâ inter cæteros infirmum, qui tamen nefando muneri ordinandi a Regina Elizabetha deputatus, tantum abfuit ut id exequeretur, ut cœcum se, adeoque imposito muneri imparem simularit, facinusque detestatus, nullis minis ad id unquam adduci potuerit (ita Hardingus in Confutatione Apologetica, part. 2, c. 2.) Id ipsum Stous, Chronologista Anglus subinde agnovit, etsi suis id Annalibus inserere, metu regiminis, non sit ausus, uti testatur nobilis vir D. Constabilis in Manuscripto proprio, pag. 13.

Agebat quoque sub id tempus in Turri Londinensi Archiepiscopus quidam Hibernus, quem propositâ libertate et præmiis hæretici deprecabantur, ut misertus orbitatis suæ Ecclesiæ Ministros ordinaret. At vir bonus, inquit Sanderus de Schismate, pag. 400. *Nullo modo adduci potuit, ut hæreticis sacras manus imponeret, vel alieno peccato communicaret.* Cum autem hæretici sua se spe cecidisse viderent, inito consilio in *Tabernam* ad *Caput Equi* in plateâ Cheapside Londini, condicto die conveniunt anno 1559, et quid agendum statuunt. Ac tandem tumultuario opere ex præsentibus (aderant enim plures) Joannem Scorium Apostatam Religiosum, haud Episcopum, deligunt, quia ordinationis speciem perageret. Is legerat ex Reformatis Tunii cujusdam librum secundum de Ecclesiâ, cap. 4, impositionem in Ecclesiâ manuum nihil aliud olim fuisse, quam dexteræ in dexteram, amicitiæ ergo, injectionem. Jubet itaque adstantes in genua procumbere, et apprehensâ ejusdam Parkeri laici dextrâ, *Eia*, inquit, *Domine Episcope Cantuariensis, surge.*

Pari modo aliqui ex iis qui aderant, hoc ritu ordinavit. Ita accidisse testatus occulatus testis Thomas Keal, Professor linguæ Hebraicæ Oxonii, cuidam suo amico Heberlei, cum uterque Religionis causâ exul ex patriæ in Belgio degeret. Prodiit quidem anno 1613. hoc est 54. annis post prædictum factum, liber Londini editus, cujusdam Formalistæ Angli, Francisci Masoni nomine: is prætendit, se in Archivo quodam invenisse Episcoporum successionem a Catholicis ordinatorum. Sed ab omnibus exploditur, quia nimirum sui dicti nullam probationem affert. Itaque illos

constat, nullam ab Ecclesiâ verâ accepisse ordinationem validam, adeoque nec characterem ullum, ac proinde eorum ordinationes esse invalidas et nullas.

Adde, quod licet per successionem legitimam, aliquam hæreticus quispiam Ordinationem Consecrationemque Episcopalem accepisset (quod tamen nullo argumento probatur) etiamnum eorum Ordinationes invalidæ dicendæ essent ob defectum materiæ, formæ et intentionis debitæ. Nullâ enim materiâ utuntur, nisi forte traditione Bibliorum, nulla forma legitima; imo formam Catholicorum adjecere, et commutavere in hanc: *Accipe potestatem prædicandi verbum Dei, et administrandi sancta ejus Sacramenta;* quæ essentialiter differt a formis Orthodoxis. Deinde, quæ intentio ab illis formari poterit, qui negant Christum aut primam Ecclesiam ullum incruentum instituisse Sacrificium? Sublato autem Sacrificio, tollitur Sacerdos, sublato Sacerdote, tollitur Episcopus, sublato alterutro *tollitur*, ut ait S. Hieron. dial. contra Luciferianos, *Ecclesia, Fides et Evangelium.*

Denique constans semper in Anglia fuit praxis, ut si hæreticorum Ministrorum ad gremium revertatur Ecclesiæ, secularis instar habeatur. Unde si ligatus sit Matrimonio, in eodem permaneat; sin liber, et ad statum Ecclesiasticum transire velit, aliorum Catholicorum more ordinetur, vel si libuerit, uxorem ducat. Ergo, &c. Feriâ 5. die 17. Aprilis 1704. in Congregatione generali S. R. et universalis Inquisitionis, habita in Palatio Apostolico apud S. Petrum coram Sanctissimo D. N. D. Clemente Divinâ Prœvidentiâ Papa XI. ac Eminentissimis et Reverendissimis Dominis S. R. Ecclesiæ Cardinalibus, in totâ Republ. Christianâ contra hæreticam pravitatem generalibus Inquisitoribus, a S. Sede Apostolicâ specialiter deputatis.

Lecto supradicto Memoriali, Sanctissimus D. noster Papa prædictus auditis votis eorundem Eminentissimorum, decrevit quod prædictus *Joannes Clemens Gordon* Orator ex integro ad omnes ordines, etiam Sacros et Presbyteratûs promoveatur, et quatenus non fuerit Sacramento Confirmationis munitus, Confirmetur.

Joseph Bartolus, S. R.
Et Universalis Inquisitionis Notarius.
Locus × Sigilli.

XVI.

The following extracts from the ancient forms of consecrating bishops are taken from the appendix to Erastus Senior.—*London edition.* 1844.

For the better understanding of the former discourse, I have here set down some Extracts out of the ancient forms of ordaining bishops in the Greek and Latin Church.

[In the present edition the extracts are given more fully, and with more exact references than appear in the margin of the first edition. The Anglican form has been added to the list. It was, of course, not intended to exhibit the entire of any consecration-service, but only such rubrics, ceremonies, and prayers as have reference to the question under discussion.—*London Editor.*]

FORMS OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

I. ANCIENT LITURGICAL WRITERS.*

[Constit. Apost., viii., 4. Coteler, PP. Apostol., i. 391.]

Unus ex primis episcopis una cum duobus aliis prope altare stans, reliquis episcopis ac presbyteris tacite orantibus, atque diaconis divina Evangelia super caput ejus qui ordinatur aperta tenentibus dicat ad Deum.

* * * *

. . . . Da in nomine tuo Deus cognitor cordis, huic servo tuo, electo a te in episcopum, pascere sanctum tuum gregem et pontificem tuum agere, inculpate ministrantem nocte ac die; et placando faciem tuam, congregare numerum eorum qui salvi fiunt, ac offerre tibi dona sanctæ tuæ Ecclesiæ. Da illi, domine omnipotens, per Christum tuum

Εἷς τῶν πρώτων ἐπισκόπων ἅμα καὶ δυσὶν ἑτέροις, πλησίον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἑστῶς, τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων σιωπῇ προσευχομένων, τῶν δὲ διακόνων τὰ θεῖα εὐαγγέλια ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ χειροτονουμένου κεφαλῆς ἀνεπτυγμένα κατεχόντων, λεγέτω πρὸς θεον.

* * * *

. . . . Δὸς ἐν τῷ ὀνοματί σου καρδιογνώστα θεὲ, ἐπὶ τὸν δοῦλόν σου τόνδε, ὃν ἐξελέξω εἰς ἐπίσκοπον, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἁγίαν σου ποίμνην, καὶ ἀρχιερατεύειν σοι, ἀμέμπτως λειτουργοῦντα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας· καὶ ἐξιλασκόμενον σοι τὸ πρόσωπον, ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σωζομένων, καὶ προσφέρειν σοι τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἁγίας σου ἐκκλησίας. Δὸς αὐτῷ, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου,

* It is hardly necessary to apprise the reader that the so-called Apostolical Constitutions, and the works of Dionysius the Areopagite, are suppositious. Yet they are admissible as evidence, and deserving of attention. The "Constitutions" were extant as early as the fourth, if not the third, century; and the compilations of the pseudo Areopagite are as ancient as the fifth.—See Alban Butler, Saints' Lives. Nov. 23, *note*, and Oct. 3, *note.*—*London Editor.*

participationem Sancti Spiritus; ut habeat potestatem remittendi peccata secundum mandatum tuum, dandi Cleros (seu ordines Ecclesiasticos) juxta præceptum tuum, et solvendi omne vinculum secundum potestatem quam tribuisti apostolis; utque tibi placeat in mansuetudine, et mundo corde, constanter, inculpate, ac irreprehensibiliter, offerendo tibi purum et incruentum sacrificium, quod per Christum constituisti mysterium Novi Testamenti, in odorem suavitatis, per sanctum Filium ac Salvatorem nostrum; per quem tibi gloria, &c.

τὴν μετουσίαν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος· ὥςτε ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναί ἁμαρτίας κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν σου, διδόναι κλήρους κατὰ τὸ προςαγμά σου, λυειν δε πάντα σύνδεσμον κατὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἣν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀποςόλοις· εὐαρεςεῖν δέ σοι ἐν πραότητι, καὶ καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ, ἀτρέπτως, ἀμέμπτως, ἀνεγκλήτως, προσφεροντά σοι καθαρὰν καὶ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν, ἣν διὰ Χριςοῦ διετάξω τὸ μυστήριον τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης, εἰς ὀσμὴν εὐωδίας, διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου σου υἱου Ἰηςοῦ Χριςοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν. δι' οὗ σοι δόξα, κ. τ. λ.

[S. Dionys. Areop. de Eccl. Hier. c. 5.]

Pontifex qui ad consecrationem in pontificem adducitur, utroque genu flexo ante altare, super caput habet evangelia, manumque pontificis, atque hoc modo ab eo pontifice qui eum consecrat sanctissimis precationibus consecratur.

Ὁ μεν ἱεράρχης ἐπὶ τὴν ἱεραρχικὴν τελείωσιν προσαγόμενος ἄμφω τῷ πόδε κλίνας ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς ἔχει τὰ θεῖα καὶ ἱερὰ εὐαγγέλια καὶ τὴν χειροτονοῦντος χεῖρα, κ. τ. λ.

II. GREEK LITURGY.

[Goar's Euchologium, 302–311.]

Explicat Evangelium Pontifex, et manum etiam admoventibus aliis Pontificibus, capiti et cervicibus Ordinati imponit. Mox cruces tres in ejus capite exprimens, et manum ei impositam tenens, precatur hoc pacto.

Dominator, Domine Deus noster, qui per celeberrimum apostolum [tuum] Paulum, graduum et ordinum seriem ad subserviendum et ministrandum venerandis et illibatis mysteriis tuis in sancto altari tuo, constitutis primo apostolis, secundo prophetis, tertio doctoribus, sanxisti:

Ἀναπτύσσει τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, καὶ ἐπιτίθησι τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ τῷ τραχήλῳ τοῦ χειροτονουμένου, συνεφαπτομένων καί τῶν ἄλλων ἀρχιερέων· εἶτα ποιῶν σταυροὺς τρεῖς ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔχων ἐπικειμένην αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα εὔχεται οὕτως.

Δέσποτα κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ νομοθετήσας ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ πανευφήμου σου ἀποςόλου Παύλου, βαθμῶν καὶ ταγμάτων τάξιν εἰς τὸ ἐξυπηρετεῖσθαι καὶ λειτουργεῖν τοῖς σεπτοῖς καὶ ἀχράντοις σου μυςηρίοις ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου θυσιαςηρίῳ, πρῶτον ἀποςόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους· αὐτὸς Δέσποτα τῶν ἁπάντων, καὶ τοῦτον

ipse omnium Domine, hunc etiam suffragiis electum, et evangelicum jugum, dignitatemque pontificalem subire dignum habitum, per meam peccatoris, et stantium ministrorum et coepiscoporum manum, adventu, et virtute, et gratia sancti tui Spiritus, corrobora; sicut sanctos apostolos et prophetas corroborasti, sicut reges unxisti, sicut pontifices sanctificasti: et irreprehensum ejus pontificatum ostende, et omni honestate illum exornans, sanctum illum renuncia: ut quæ populi saluti expediunt postulet, et a te exaudiri dignus fiat . . . .

* * * *

Pontifex eodem modo impositam Ordinati vertici manum tenens, hoc pacto precatur.

Domine Deus noster, qui humana natura deitatis tuæ præsentiam nullatenus ferente, tua dispensatione doctores simili nobiscum ratione passibiles thronum tuum obtinentes, hostiam et oblationem pro cuncto populo sacrificaturos constituisti. Tu Domine, etiam hunc pontificalis gratiæ dispensatorem renunciatum, Tui veri pastoris imitatorem, animam pro tuis ovibus ponentem, cæcorum ducem, in tenebris lucem, insipientium præceptorem, infantium doctorem, in mundo luminare effice: ut animas sibi creditas reparans tribunali tuo inconfusè in præsenti vita astet,* et magnam mercedem pro evangelii tui prædicatione decertaturis a te præparatam reportet. Tuum enim est misereri, et salvare, Deus.

τὸν ψηφισθέντα καὶ ἀξιωθέντα ὑπεισελθεῖν τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν ζυγὸν καί τὴν ἀρχιερατικὴν ἀξίαν, διὰ τῆς χειρὸς ἐμοῦ τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, καὶ τῶν συμπαρόντων λειτουργῶν, καὶ συνεπισκόπων, τῇ ἐπιφοιτήσει, καὶ δυνάμει, καὶ χάριτι τοῦ ἁγίου σου Πνεύματος ἐνίσχυσον, ὡς ἐνίσχυσας τοὺς ἁγίους ἀποστόλους καὶ προφήτας, ὡς ἔχρισας τοὺς βασιλεῖς, ὡς ἡγίασας τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς· καὶ ἀνεπίληπτον αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ἀπόδειξον, καὶ πάσῃ σεμνότητι κατακοσμῶν, ἅγιον ἀνάδειξον εἰς τὸ ἄξιον γενέσθαι τοῦ αἰτεῖν αὐτὸν τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν τοῦ λαοῦ, καί ὑπακούειν σε αὐτοῦ . .

* * * *

Ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἔχων ὡσαύτως τῇ τοῦ χειροτονουμένου κορυφῇ τὴν χεῖρα ἐπικειμένην, εὐχεται οὕτως.

Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ὁ διὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι τὴν ἀνθρώπου φύσιν τὴν τῆς θεότητος ὑπενεγκεῖν οὐσίαν, τῇ σῇ οἰκονομίᾳ ὁμοιοπαθεῖς ἡμῖν διδασκάλους καταςήσας, τὸν σὸν ἐπέχοντας θρόνον, εἰς τὸ ἀναφέρειν σοι θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ σου. Σὺ Κύριε, καὶ τοῦτον τὸν ἀναδειχθέντα οἰκονομον τῆς ἀρχιερατικῆς χάριτος ποιήσον γενέσθαι μιμητὴν σου τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ ποιμένος, τιθέντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων σου· ὁδηγὸν τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων, φωστῆρα ἐν κόσμῳ· ἵνα καταρτίσας τὰς ψυχὰς τάς ἐμπιστευθείσας αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς παρούσης ζωῆς παραςῇ τῳ βηματί σου ἀκαταισχύντως· καὶ τον μεγαν μισθον λήψηται ὃν ἡτοιμασας τοῖς ἀθλήσασι ὑπὲρ του κηρυγματὸς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σου· σὸν γάρ ἐςι τὸ ἐλεεῖν καὶ σώζειν ὁ θεός.

[Habert Liber Pontificalis, p. 67.]

Deinde Patriarcha Evangelii librum explicans imponit cervici et

Εἶτα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὁ Πατριάρχης ἀναπτύσσων, ἐπιτίθησι τῷ τραχήλῳ καὶ τῇ

* Ut perficiens animas sibi creditas in hac vitâ sistatur tribunali tuo absque confusione: as Habert more correctly translates, p. 69.—*Editor.*

capiti ipsius, contingentibus pontificibus omnibus. Antequam vero imponatur Evangelium, consignat etiam iterum caput ipsius, contingentibus quoque pontificibus cæteris. Priusquam autem Evangelium imponatur, consignat caput ipsius ter. Evangelio autem imposito, Patriarcha sic precatur.

κεφαλῇ αὐτου, συνεφαπτομένων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων πάντων. Πρὸ τοῦ τεθεῖναι δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, σφραγίζει καὶ αὖθις τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, συνεφαπτομένων καὶ τῶν αρχιερέων πάντων. Πρὸ τοῦ τεθεῖναι δὲ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, σφραγίζει δὲ αὖθις τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ τρίς· τοῦ δὲ Εναγγελίου τεθέντος ὁ πατριάρχης εὐχεται οὕτως.

Domine Dominator, Deus noster, &c.

Δέσποτα κύριε . . . .

Domine Deus noster, &c.

Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

III. SYRIAN NESTORIAN LITURGY.

[Morinus' Version. Apud Martene, De Antiq. Eccl. Ritibus, l. 1, c. 8. Art. xi. *ordo* 21.]

. . . . *Evangelium accipit Præsul et imponit illud super dorsum illius qui ordinatur . . . . Cum imponitur Evangelium super dorsum ejus qui ordinatur, omnes episcopi qui illic sunt imponunt manus suas super illum ex utroque latere donec omnes preces absolutæ fuerint . . . . Et repetit Præsul:*

Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi quæ omni tempore deficientia supplet, &c. . . . . Precamur omnes pro eo, ut veniat donum tuum, Deus, et cum virtute perficiat, et consummet in ministerio episcopali, gratia et misericordia Unigeniti tui . . .

Et repetit Præsul, cum imponit manum dextram super caput ejus qui ordinatur; sinistram vero extendit extensione deprecatoria, dicens:

Deus noster bone et liberalis . . . . Tu Domine, in multitudine donorum tuorum inenarrabilium posuisti nos intercessores istorum donorum tuorum divinorum et cælestium quæ nobis data sunt ab auxilio Majestatis tuæ, et concessa nobis in adjumentum hominum et in redemptionem communem per manus infirmitatis nostræ in ecclesia tua sancta sponsa tua quam despondisti Filio tuo et coronasti redemptione ejus per passionem Christi tui. Et quemadmodum, Domine, traditio apostolica quæ per Chirotoniam deducta est ad nos, et impositio manus ministerii ecclesiastici et beneplacito consensuque sanctæ Trinitatis. . . . . Oramus omnes pro eo, ut veniat super eum gratia Spiritus Sancti cum vehe-

menti amoris affectu et illapsu divino ; perficiatque et sanctificet eum, et compleat ad opus perfectum magni hujus et excellentis ministerii ad quod accedit gratia et misericordia Unigeniti tui. Nunc [et semper]. *Postea signat eum qui ordinatur. Respondent* Amen.

* * * * * * *

Et recitat Præsul eam orationem quæ dici solet super episcopos, quæ eadem recitatur super Metropolitam.

Deus Dominus ab æterno occultorum cognitor . . . . Indue eum, Domine, virtute ex alto, ut liget et solvat in cælis et in terra, atque in impositione manus ejus curentur infirmi, fiantque per eum virtutes in nomine tuo sancto ad laudem Divinitatis tuæ, et creet in virtute doni tui presbyteros et diaconos et diaconissas et subdiaconos et lectores in ministerium ecclesiæ tuæ sanctæ, &c. . . . .

IV. ANCIENT WESTERN LITURGY.

[Egbert's Pontifical. MS. of the eighth century.—Martene, *ubi supra, ordo* 2.]

Episcopus cum ordinatur, duo episcopi ponant et teneant evangeliorum librum super cervicem ejus, et unus fundat super eum benedictionem ; et postea istas tres orationes omnes episcopi, qui adsunt, recitare debent : reliqui vero manus suas super caput ejus tangant.

Oremus, dilectissimi nobis, huic viro ill.* ad utilitatem ecclesiæ provehendo benignitatem omnipotentis Dei qui gratiæ suæ tribuat largitatem. Per.

Adesto supplicationibus nostris, omnipotens Deus, et quod humilitatis nostræ gerendum est ministerio, tuæ virtutis impleatur effectu. Per.

Propitiare, Domine, supplicationibus nostris, et inclinato super hunc famulum tuum ill. cornu gratiæ sacerdotalis, benedictionis tuæ in eum infunde virtutem. Per.

* Notum est *Ill.* indicare nomen ponendum, idemque valere quod nunc *N. N.* Litteram *N.* loco nominis proprii Menardus (ad Sacrament. S. Gregor.) paulo ante annum M. poni cœpisse putat. Mabillonius ante annos octingentos: quod annotavit Ducangius. Vide l. 2. A. Diplom. cap. 22, n. 17.—(Lazerus, De antiquis formulis fidei.—*Editor.*

Exaudi, Domine supplicum preces, ut quod nostro gerendum est ministerio, tua potius virtute firmetur. Per.

Iterum unus ex eis dicat hanc orationem super episcopum.

Deus honorum omnium, Deus omnium dignitatum, quæ gloriæ tuæ sacris famulantur ordinibus, Deus qui Moysen famulum tuum secreti familiaris affectu, inter cætera cælestis documenta culturæ, de habitu quoque indumenti sacerdotalis instituens electum Aaron mystico amictu vestiri inter sacra jussisti, ut intelligentiæ sensum de exemplis priorum caperet secutura posteritas, ne eruditio doctrinæ ullæ deesset ætati, cum et apud veteres reverentiam ipsa significationum species obtineret, et apud nos certiora essent experimenta rerum quam ænigmata figurarum. . . . . Et idcirco huic famulo tuo ill. quem ad summi sacerdotii ministerium elegisti, hanc, quæsumus Domine, gratiam largiaris, ut quidquid illa velamina in fulgore auri, in nitore gemmarum, in multimodi operis varietate signabant, hoc in ejus moribus actibusque clarescat. Comple in sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam, et ornamentis totius glorificationis instructum eum cælestis unguenti flore [rore] sanctifica. Hoc, Domine, copiose in ejus caput influat. Hoc in oris subjecta decurrat. Hoc in totius corporis extrema descendat; ut tui Spiritus virtus et interiora ejus repleat, et exteriora circumtegat. Abundet in eo constantia fidei, puritas dilectionis, sinceritas pacis . . . . Da ei, quæsumus, claves regni cælorum; ut quodcumque ligaverit super terram sit ligatum et in cælis; et quodcumque solverit super terram sit solutum et in cælis; et quorum detenuerit peccata detenta sint, et quorum remiserit, tu Domine dimittere digneris. . . . . Tribue ei cathedram episcopalem ad regendam ecclesiam tuam et plebem universam. Sis ei auctoritas, sis potestas, sis ei firmitas: multiplices super eum benedictionem et gratiam tuam, ut ad exorandam semper misericordiam tuam, tuo munere idoneus, tua gratia possit esse devotus.

Unguantur manus istæ, et sancti✠ficentur, et in te Deo deorum ordinentur. Ungue has manus oleo sanctificato, et chrismate unctionis purificato, sicut unxit Moises verbo oris sui manus sancti Aaron germani sui. Et sicut unxit Spiritus sanctus per suos flatus omnium sacerdotum, et sicut Jesus Salvator omnium nostrorum sanctas manus [suorum apostolorum; ita unguantur manus istæ] et sanctificentur et consecrentur, ut in omnibus sint perfectæ in nomine tuo, Pater, Filiique tui, atque æterni Spiritus sancti, qui

es unus ac summus Deus omnium vivorum et mortuorum manens in sæcula sæculorum.

Unguatur et consecretur caput tuum cælesti benedictione in ordine pontificali. In nomine Patris, &c.

[Salzburg Pontifical. MS. of the 12th century, and ancient Roman Ordo. Martene, *ordo* 8.]

. . . . *Deinde imponat clerus letaniam, et prosternat se Ordinator Electi simul cum Electo et cæteris episcopis ante altare super stramenta usque dum dicat schola* Agnus Dei. *Ut autem surrexerint, duo episcopi ponunt et tenent Evangeliorum codicem super verticem ejus et inter scapulas clausum, et uno fundente super ea* [*eum*] *benedictionem, reliqui omnes qui adsunt manibus suis caput ejus tangunt, et dicat Ordinator orationem:*

Adesto, Domine, supplicationibus, &c.

Oremus dilectissimi, &c.

Propitiare, &c.

Tunc incipit alta voce:

Per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Dominus vobiscum. Sursum corda. Gratias agamus, ... ✠æterne Deus, honor omnium dignitatum quæ gloriæ tuæ sacratis famulantur ordinibus, &c. . . . . *usque* . . . . cælestis unguenti flore sanctifica.

Hic mittatur chrisma in caput ejus in modum crucis, et dicatur:

Ungatur et consecretur caput tuum cælesti benedictione in ordine pontificali, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti.

Pax tibi. *Res.* Et cum spiritu tuo. Hoc, Domine, copiose in ejus caput influat, &c. . . . . possit esse devotus. Per *Ut in ordine Romano.*

Unguantur manus istæ de oleo sanctificato et chrismate sanctificationis, &c. . . . . *ut in ordine Romano.*

[MSS. Pontificals of the Monastery of Bec, 12th or 13th century. Martene, *ordo* 11.]

Episcopum qui ordinandus est duo episcopi per manus de secretario, antequam evangelium legatur, deducant ante altare; et eo inibi prosternato, ab archiepiscopo inchoetur letania; qua

finita, et eo erecto, ponatur evangelium super scapulas ejus; et has dicant episcopi super ipsum orationes:

Oremus dilectissimi . . . .

Adesto supplicationibus nostris . . . .

Propitiare, Domine, supplicationibus . . . .

Solus vero archiepiscopus hanc dicat consecrationem, cæteris astantibus, et duobus episcopis Evangelium super ipsum qui ordinandus est tenentibus.

Deus honorum omnium, Deus omnium dignitatum, quæ gloriæ tuæ sacris famulantur ordinibus, &c. . . . .

Consecratio manuum episcopi ab archiepiscopo oleo sancto et chrismate.

Unguantur manus istæ et sanctificentur, et in te Deo deorum ordinentur, &c. . . . .

Hic mittatur oleum super caput ejus.

Ungatur et consecretur caput tuum, &c. . . . .

[MS. Roman Pontifical. Martene, *ordo* 17.]

Sequitur oratio pro electo; quæ dicitur in secundo et tertio vel ultimo loco inter primas orationes de Missa.

Adesto supplicationibus . . . .

Et cætera ex more cantentur usque ad repetitionem Alleluia, *vel ad ultimum versum tractus. Interim . . . duo episcopi pluvialibus induti deducant* [electum] *superius ante altare coram Apostolico. Et ille sedendo dicit:*

Episcopum oportet judicare, interpretari, consecrare, confirmare, ordinare, offerre, et baptizare.

Deinde surgens et convertens se Apostolicus ad circumstantes dicit hanc orationem:

Oremus, dilectissimi nobis, ut huic viro utilitati ecclesiæ providens benignitas omnipotentis Dei gratiæ tribuat largitatem. Per Dominum.

Et statim ipse incipit Kyrie eleison *cum letania, et prosternit se, &c.* . . . .

Ut autem surrexerint, duo episcopi ponunt et tenent evangeliorum codicem super cervicem ejus et inter scapulas clausum: episcopo super eum fundente benedictionem. Reliqui episcopi qui adsunt manibus suis caput ejus tangant. Et dicat ordinator alta voce, alii vero submissa in modum orationis:

Propitiare, Domine, supplicationibus, &c. . . . .

Et dicat alta voce, et astantes submissa in modum Præfationis:

Per omnia sæculorum. Amen.

Dominus vobiscum. Et cum spiritu tuo.

Sursum corda . . . . Habemus.

Gratias . . . . . Habemus.

Vere dignum et justum est, æquum et salutare: Nos tibi semper et ubique gratias agere, &c. . . . . honor omnium dignitatum quæ gloriæ tuæ famulantur ordinibus. Deus qui per Moysen famulum tuum secreti familiaris affatu, &c. . . . . cælestis unguenti rore sanctifica.

. . . . *Deinde consecrator mittat chrisma super caput ejus in modum crucis* . . . .

Ungatur et consecretur caput tuum cælesti bene✠dictione in ordine pontificali, in nomine Pa✠tris, et Fi✠lii, et Spiritus✠ Sancti. Amen.

Hoc, Domine, copiose in caput ejus influat. Hoc in oris subjecta decurrat. Hoc in totius corporis, &c. . . . . tuo munere idoneus, tua gratia possit esse devotus. *Et respondent omnes:* Amen.

Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui te ad pontificatus sublimari voluit dignitatem, ipse te chrismate et mysticæ delibutionis liquore perfundat, et spiritualis bene✠dictionis ubertate fœcundet, ut quidquid sanctificaveris sanctificetur: et consecratæ manus tuæ vel pollicis impositio cunctis proficiat ad salutem. *Res.* Amen.

[MS. Pontifical of Lyons, 14th century. Martene, *ordo* 18.]

Letania finita, surgunt omnes: et Consecratore ante altare stante, vultu ad chorum verso, et Electo ante illum genuflectente, Consecrator aperiat codicem Evangeliorum, ponens illum super caput et scapulas Consecrandi, et duo episcopi sustineant illum, littera ex parte inferiore manente. Tunc Ordinator imponat utramque manum super caput illius dicens: Accipe Spiritum Sanctum. *Idemque faciant et dicant omnes episcopi tam tenentes librum, quam alii successive. Quo facto, illo genuflectente, dicat Ordinator media voce, et etiam alii episcopi, submissa tamen voce, cum ipso:*

Propitiare, Domine, &c. . . . .

Deinde dicat Consecrator voce mediocri, junctis manibus ante

pectus, et alii etiam episcopi tenentes libros idem dicant submissa voce:

Per omnia, &c. . . . .

Deus honorum, &c. . . . . *usque* rore sanctifica.

Hic incipiat Consecrator flexis genibus Sequentiam: Veni, Sancte Spiritus. *Et mox surgens dum cantatur, mittat chrisma in caput illius in modum crucis. . . . . et tam ipse quam alii episcopi dicant quasi legendo:*

Ungatur et consecretur caput tuum, &c. . . . .

Sed secundum morem quarumdam ecclesiarum omnes episcopi, qui adsunt, similiter perungunt successive caput illius manibus suis, et singuli dicunt: Unguatur et consecretur, &c. *ut supra; quod nec juri, nec Ecclesiæ Romanæ consuetudini consentaneum est.*

Expleta unctione, et finita Sequentia, Pontifex resumat iterum in pristino tono, et dicat:

Hoc Domine copiose, &c. . . . . *usque* possit esse devotus. *Quod sequitur dicat plane quasi legendo.* Per Dominum. *Et respondeant omnes episcopi:* Amen.

*Item alia oratio.**

Pater Sancte, omnipotens Deus, qui per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum ab initio cuncta creasti . . . . præsta ut hic famulus tuus sit ministeriis cunctisque fideliter gerendis officiis dignus, ut antiquitus instituta sacramentorum possit mysteria celebrare, per te in summum ad quod assumitur sacerdotium consecretur, sit super eundem benedictio tua, licet manu nostra sit porrecta. Præcipe Domine, huic pascere oves tuas, ac tribue ut in commissi gregis custodiam sollicitus pastor invigilet. . . . .

. . . . *Mox confirmet et inungat ambas manus illius et pollices cum chrismate . . . . et perungendo dicat Consecrator tam ipse quam alii episcopi:*

Ungantur manus istæ et sanctificentur, et in te Deo deorum ordinentur, &c. . . .

V. ROMAN PONTIFICAL.

Published by Clement VIII. (1596,) and Urban VIII. (1644.)

This agrees with the foregoing so closely, that the variations, such as the following, need hardly be specified.

* This additional prayer is also found in the Bec MS., and in the more ancient one of Jumieges.—Martene, ii., 40–63.—*Editor.*

Tum Consecrator, accepto libro Evangeliorum, illum apertum, adjuvantibus Episcopis assistentibus, nihil dicens imponit super cervicem et scapulas Electi, &c. . . . . quem unus ex capellanis Electi, post illum genuflexus, quousque liber ipse eidem Electo in manus tradendus sit [after the anointing of the head and the hands, and the delivery of the pastoral staff and the ring,] *continue sustinet.*

* * * * * *

Ungatur et consecretur caput tuum cælesti benedictione in ordine Pontificali. In nomine ✠ Patris, et Fi ✠ lii, et Spiritus ✠ Sancti. *Res.* Amen. Pax tibi. *Res.* Et cum spiritu tuo.

* * * * * *

Ungantur manus istæ de oleo sanctificato, et chrismate sanctificationis, sicut unxit Samuel David Regem et Prophetam, ita ungantur, et consecrentur. In nomine Dei Pa✠tris, et Fi✠lii, et Spiritus ✠ Sancti, facientes imaginem sanctæ crucis Salvatoris nostræ Jesu Christi, qui nos a morte redemit, et ad regna cælorum perduxit. Exaudi nos pie Pater omnipotens, æterne Deus; et præsta, ut, quod te rogamus, exoremus. Per eundem Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

Deus et Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui te ad Pontificatus sublimari voluit dignitatem ipse te chrismate, et mysticæ delibutionis liquore perfundat, et spiritualis bene✠dictionis ubertate fœcundet; quidquid bene✠dixeris, benedicatur; et quidquid sanctificaveris, sanctificetur; et consecratæ manus istius, vel pollicis impositio cunctis proficiat ad salutem. Amen.

VI. BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

[Keeling's Liturgiæ Britannicæ.]

In the Litany:]

That it may please thee to bless this our brother elected, and to send thy grace upon him, that he may duly execute the office whereunto he is called, to the edifying of thy church, and to the honour, praise, and glory of thy name:

Answer. We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

[*At the end of the Litany:*]

Almighty God, giver of all good things, who by thy Holy Spirit hast appointed divers orders of ministers in thy church, mercifully behold this thy servant, now called to the work and ministry of a bishop, and replenish him so with the truth of thy doctrine, and adorn him with innocency of life, that both by word and deed he may faithfully serve thee in this office to the glory of thy name, and the edifying and well-governing of thy church, through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen.

[*After the Hymn*—Come, Holy Ghost.]

Almighty God and most merciful Father, who of thine infinite goodness hast given thy only and dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ to be our redeemer, and the author of everlasting life; who, after that he had made perfect our redemption by his death, and was ascended into heaven, poured down his gifts abundantly upon men, making some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and doctors, to the edifying and making perfect his church; grant, we beseech thee, to this thy servant, such grace that he may evermore be ready to spread abroad thy gospel, the glad tidings of reconciliation with thee, and use the authority given him, not to destruction, but to salvation, not to hurt, but to help; so that as a wise and faithful servant, giving to thy family their portion in due season, he may at last be received into everlasting joy through Jesus Christ our Lord, who, &c.

"Then the archbishop and bishops present shall lay their hands upon the elected bishop, kneeling before them upon his knees, the archbishop saying,"—

[*Form adopted at the Review in* 1662, *and thenceforth used.*]*	[*Form set forth in* 1552, *and in use for a hundred and ten years.*]
Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a bishop in the church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.	Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by imposition of hands; for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and of soberness.

* The most minute variations of phrase occurring in the several editions are carefully noted by Mr. Keeling.

And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness.

[*Edition of* 1549.]

"Then the archbishop shall deliver him the bible, saying,"—

Give heed unto reading, exhortation, and doctrine. Think upon the things contained in this book, &c. . .

"Then the archbishop shall lay the bible upon his neck, saying,"—

Give heed unto reading, exhortation, &c. . . . .

"Then the archbishop shall proceed in the communion service; with whom the new consecrated bishop (with others) shall also communicate."

[*Post-communion Prayer.*]

Most merciful Father, we beseech thee to send down upon this thy servant thy heavenly blessing, and so endue him with thy Holy Spirit, that he, preaching thy word, may not only be earnest to reprove, beseech, and rebuke, with all patience and doctrine, but also may be to such as believe a wholesome example in word, in conversation, in love, in faith, in chastity, and in purity; that, faithfully fulfilling his course, at the latter day he may receive the crown of righteousness laid up by the Lord, the righteous judge, who liveth and reigneth, &c. . . . . .

THE END.

ERRATA.

Page 74, 22d line, for *or*, read *nor*.
" 131, 7th line, for *never seen*, read *never had seen*.
" 137, 10th line, for *lines*, read *times*.
" 226, last line, note, for *Bancroft's Sermons*, 588–9, read *Bancroft's Sermon*, 1588–9.
" 239, 9th line, for *irrevelant*, read *irrelevant*.
" 319, 20th line, for *supplementes*, read *supplentes*.
" 328, 1st line, for *oratur* read *orator*.

262.17K
K411.2

Kenrick, P.R.

Validity of Anglican ordinations.

262.17K
K411.2